

This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`







HISTORY OF CONGREGATIONALISM.

HISTORY OF CONGREGATIONALISM

FROM

ABOUT A. D. 250 TO THE PRESENT TIME

IN CONTINUATION OF THE ACCOUNT OF THE ORIGIN AND EARLIEST HISTORY OF THIS SYSTEM OF CHURCH POLITY CONTAINED IN "A VIEW OF CONGREGATIONALISM"

BY

GEORGE PUNCHARD

SECOND EDITION

REWRITTEN AND GREATLY ENLARGED

VOL. II.

NEW YORK
PUBLISHED BY HURD AND HOUGHTON
BOSTON: E. P. DUTTON AND COMPANY
1865

110. j. 441.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1865, by
GEORGE PUNCHARD,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

RIVERSIDE, CAMBRIDGE:
STEREOTYPED AND PRINTED BY
H. O. HOUGHTON AND COMPANY.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

CHAPTER I.

RÉSUMÉ OF ECCLESIASTICAL MATTERS PRIOR TO THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.

The struggle of Congregational principles with ecclesiastical despotism, 1. Lollardism in England at the dawn of the Reformation, 3. Lambert's congregational sentiments in 1538, p. 7. Froude's mistake respecting the extinction of Lollardism after 1417, p. 8. The corrupt state of the English hierarchy to the end of the fifteenth century, 14. The first twenty years of Henry VIII.'s reign, 23. Wolsey's reformatory purposes, 24. "The Supplication of Beggars," 1527, p. 26. An "Act of Accusation" against the clergy, 27. Petition of the clergy of Bangor, 31. "A Supplication of the poor Commons," 1546, p. 33.

CHAPTER II.

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.

The marriage of Henry VIII. and Catharine of Aragon, 37. Henry begins to disclose his doubts about his marriage, 40. First movement towards a divorce, 1527, p. 42. Persecution of protestants, 44. The legates' court to try Henry's cause in England, 48. Wolsey in trouble, 49. Dr. Cranmer's plan to get the opinions of the learned about Henry's marriage, 52. A parliament called — Important reformatory measures, 54. Summary of opinions on the king's marriage, 57. Bribery freely employed, 58. Opinions laid before parliament and convocation, 62. The statutes of Præmunire and Provisors, 63. The pope's dilemma, 65. Important bills before parliament in 1531–32, p. 66. The people destroying images and crucifixes, 68.

The plotting and counterplotting of Clement VII., Charles V., Francis I., and Henry VIII., 69. Henry and Francis make a league of friendship, 1532, p. 71. Henry marries Anne Boleyn, January 25th, 1532-33 — Cranmer made archbishop of Canterbury, 72. The divorce of Henry, May 23d, 1533, p. 73. Appeals to Rome forbidden, 74. Sensation at Rome, 75. The league between Henry and Francis broken, 76. Pope Paul prepares his terrible bull against Henry, 79. Promulgated, 1538, p. 80. Reformatory measures pushed forward, 81. The "Maid of Kent," 85. Henry pronounced supreme head of the church of England, 90.

CHAPTER III.

PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION. — THE FIRST ENTIRE BIBLE IN ENGLISH PRINTED. — SUBSEQUENT ISSUES OF THE SCRIPTURES IN ENGLISH.

Important reformatory measures and acts — Visitation of the monasteries, 1535 — Fall of Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More — "A Goodly Prymer," 93. Coverdale's Bible, 1535, p. 96. Act of parliament (1536) extinguishing the authority of the bishop of Rome, 102. Royal proclamation against holy-days — The first proclamation and injunctions in favor of Tyndale and Rogers' English Bible, 1537, p. 108. Cranmer and Cromwell's interest in the movement, 108. Exposure of clerical trickery, 113. Condemnation of "St. Thomas à Becket," and demolition of his shrine, 114. Bishop Hilsey's primer — Publication of the "Great Bible," 117. Taverner's Bible, 119. Bible era of the Reformation, 121. Anthony Marler, the publisher of folio Bibles, 124. In six years thirty thousand Bibles and forty thousand Testaments published in English, 125.

CHAPTER IV.

OBSTACLES TO THE ENGLISH REFORMATION. — THE CHANGEABLE COURSE OF THE KING. — TRACT AND BIBLE DISTRIBUTORS.

The pope's efforts against the Reformation, 127. The Maid of Kent, 128. The mendicant monks — Bishop Fisher and Sir

Thomas More, 130. The Irish rebellion — The fall of Anne Boleyn, 131. "Pilgrimage of Grace" — Threatened invasion by Charles V., 132. Bishop Gardiner's doings — Retrogression of the king, 133. The terrible "Six Articles Act," 134. Five hundred persons under indictment, 135. Resignation of bishops Latimer and Shaxton, 136. Fall of Cromwell, 137. Birth of Edward VI. — Death of Jane Seymour, 138. Anne of Cleves — Catharine Howard — Catharine Parr, 139. Retrograde course of Henry, 141. The Six Articles Act slightly modified, 142. A litany in English — "King Henry's Primer" in English and Latin, 144. English books prohibited, 145. Death and character of Henry VIII., 146. Tract and Bible distributors, 150.

CHAPTER V.

REIGN OF EDWARD VI., 1546–1553. — PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION. — DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED.

Accession of Edward, January 31st, 1546-47 — Carefully educated, 154. Henry's plan for governing during his son's minority, 155. Persecution stopped, 155. Exiles invited home, 156. Cranmer's "slow and safe" plan of reformation, 157. Homilies published, 158. Injunctions, 159. Opposition of the papists, particularly Gardiner, Bonner, and the Lady Mary, 161. The people outrun the government in reforming, 162. Edward's first parliament, 163. Act relating to "the sacrament of the altar," 164. Proclamation against "irreverent talkers of the sacrament," 165. Repeal of all the persecuting statutes, 168. Bishops to be made by the king's letters patent, 170. Church revenues given to the king, 171. Commotion occasioned by these measures, 172. Committee to prepare a book of common prayer, etc., 174. The new service book adopted by act of parliament, January, 1548-49, p. 176. The fatal error of the Reformers to attempt to enforce absolute uniformity, 180. Marriage of ecclesiastical persons authorized, 181. David's Psalms in metre, by Sternhold and Hopkins, 181. Troubles and anxieties of the Reformers, 182. Proclamations against innovators — against preaching, 183. Open rebellion caused by turning arable land into pastures, and fencing in

commons, 184. Rumors that the new service was to be laid aside, 185. Act of parliament abolishing all other books of service, 188. The childish superstitions of the times, 189. Altars superseded by tables in the churches, 191. Preaching on week-days, 192.

CHAPTER VI.

THE VESTMENT CONTROVERSY. — REMOVAL OF THE OLD BISHOPS. — COMPLETION OF THE REFORMATION. — IRREGULARITIES, FRAUD, AND CORRUPTION.

Disagreement among the Reformers about priestly vestments, 193. Appointment of John Hooper to the bishopric of Gloucester, 1550 — His objection to the oath of supremacy and to the vestments — The controversy, 194. Hooper unwillingly yields, and is consecrated, March, 1550-51, p. 201. Ridley, Hooper's great opponent, convinced of his error, 202. Others who sympathized with Hooper, 204. Importance ascribed to preaching by the Reformers, 206. Removal of the old bishops, 209. Book of Common Prayer revised, ratified, and adopted by parliament, 211. Doctrinal articles agreed on, 212. "The reformation of doctrine and worship brought to their perfection," 1582, p. 214. The fraud and corruption of this reign, 215.

CHAPTER VII.

ECCLESIASTICAL OPINIONS OF THE ENGLISH REFORMERS. — DISSENTERS IN EDWARD'S REIGN. — END OF THE REFORMATION.

The English Reformation a triumph of Lollardism, 223. The Scriptures recognized as the rule of faith and church order, 224. Two orders of clergy only recognized — The equality of bishops and priests admitted, 230. The rights of the people to choose their own pastors and to exercise discipline allowed, 240. Baptism and the Lord's supper the only scriptural sacraments, 244. Laymen, in cases of necessity, might do ministerial work, 245. The *jure divino* of episcopacy not recognized, 246. Dissenters in Edward's reign, 250. John Champney, 251. John Ashton, 258. Michael Thombe —

Joan Bocher, 254. George Van Parres, 256. The last two, only, burned, 256. Anabaptists and other dissenters — Congregations of "sectaries" in Essex, Kent, and other places, 257. Cranmer not a persecutor — The case of Bocher, 260. Summary of Edward's work — Death of Edward, 268. Why the Reformers did not go further, 268.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE REIGN OF MARY, 1553–1558.

The abortive attempt to set Mary aside, 271. Lady Jane Grey, 272. Mary aided by the protestants, 273. Her promise to the Suffolk men disregarded, 274. Throws off all disguise, and begins the work of persecution, 276. Cranmer refuses to flee, 277. Mary's first parliament, 278. Trial of Cranmer, Lord Dudley, and Lady Jane Grey — The Spanish match, 280. Protestant rebellion, 282. Executions, 283. Romish movements, 284. Seven protestant bishops removed summarily, 285. Pretended debate at Oxford, April, 1554; Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer against fourteen papists, 287. Philip arrives in July and marries Mary, 289. Bonner raving about — Third and most important parliament — All laws against popery repealed, and the old persecuting statutes revived, 290. Cardinal Pole arrives — The kingdom reconciled to the pope — Great rejoicing, 292.

CHAPTER IX.

MARTYRDOM OF THE PROTESTANTS. — MARY'S DEATH AND CHARACTER.

Trial of protestant divines, 295. John Rogers burnt, February 4th, 1554-55, p. 297. Sanders, February 8th, and Hooper and Taylor on the 9th — The reign of terror fully inaugurated, 298. Fails to intimidate the protestants — Gardiner gives up to Bonner, 299. Philip's confessor condemns burning for religion, 300. Gardiner and the bishops try to avoid the odium of the persecution, 301. A temporary lull — Burnings resumed, 302. Bonner grows weary, but the king and queen set

him on afresh, 303. John Bradford burned, 304. Ridley and Latimer, 308. Further popish legislation — Death of Gardiner, 309. Numerous victims between November, 1555, and May following, 310. Inquisitorial scheme, 314. Quickened activity in persecution, 316. Case of Richard Woodman, 317. A coffle of prisoners sent to Bonner, 319. George Eagle, 321. John Rough, 322. Persecution stopped during the sessions of parliament, 324. Irritated state of the public mind — Loss of Calais, 325. Cuthbert Sympson burned, 326. Proclamation against good books, 327. Congregation at Islington arrested, April, 1558, p. 328. Mary's last parliament, November 5th — Gloomy national prospects, 329. Death of Mary, 330. Her odious character, 331. Summary of her victims, 334. A miserably memorable reign, 338.

CHAPTER X.

CONGREGATIONALISM IN QUEEN MARY'S REIGN.

Evidence of distinct bodies of dissenters all through this reign, 342. Rev. John Rough and Deacon Cuthbert Sympson, of the London congregational church, 343. Met in secret places, often changed, 348. Different pastors, 349. Took up large collections for the relief of the prisoners, 351. Dissenting churches in other places, 352. Humphrey Middleton, 357. Many of these churches essentially Congregational, 358. What Penry said about them, 360. Robinson's remarks, 362.

CHAPTER XI.

THE CHURCHES OF THE EXILES, PARTICULARLY THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH AT FRANKFORT, GERMANY.

Hundreds fled from Mary's persecution to Germany, Switzerland, Holland, and elsewhere — Churches organized by them, 365. History of the English church at Frankfort, 366. The church organized, and the exiles in other cities invited to join it — Intermeddling, 370. Calvin's opinion of the English Book of Common Prayer, 371. Harmonious agreement of the church, 372. Trouble made by Dr. Cox and party — Knox opposes

him, 373. The English service introduced — Church divided, 375. Other churches of the exiles — Congregationalism of the Frankfort church, 376. History of this church after the division, 381. The controversy between the pastor and elders and "Master Ashley," 382. The church assumes supreme authority in discipline, 383. This controversy leads to the preparation and adoption of a "New Discipline," which is essentially Congregational, 384. This discipline described, 385–396.

CHAPTER XII.

ACCESSION OF ELIZABETH, 1558. — PUBLIC ACTS RELATING TO RELIGION. — ROMISH TENDENCIES OF THE QUEEN.

The joyful accession of Elizabeth, November 17th, 1558, p. 399. Her character and education, 401. Ever a dissembler, 403. Environed with difficulties, 404. Her councillors and responsible advisers, 405. Everything in the church unaltered for "a full month," 406. Intimations of her regard for protestantism, 407. Controversies between the papists and protestants, 410. Elizabeth crowned, January, 1558-59, p. 412. First parliament, 413. Act of supremacy, 414. Restoration of Edward's Book of Common Prayer, 419. The queen's authority to order and change the rites and ceremonies of the church, 422. Opposition to the acts of supremacy and uniformity, 425. The new service introduced, June 24th, 1559, p. 426. First high commission court — The queen's injunctions, 427. The oath of supremacy generally taken by the clergy, 430. Monuments of idolatry destroyed, 431. Consecration of the protestant bishops — Romish inclinations of the queen, 433. The pope's overtures to the queen, 439.

CHAPTER XIII.

CONFORMITY ENFORCED. — PERSECUTION OF THE PURITANS. — SEPARATISTS' MEETINGS, 1564–1566.

The new bishops at first averse to severe measures, 442. The queen complains of the lack of uniformity, 443. Persecution begun — Sampson and Humphrey summoned before the com-

missioners, 444. Archbishop Parker's "Advertisements" — The puritans' friends in the council, 445. The high commission court described, 446, note. Parker in a fret, 447. The London ministers arraigned and compelled to answer, 448. Persecution brisk, 449. Cambridge thwarts the archbishop, 450. London churches closed — The people enraged against the clergy, 451. The press employed, 452. Separate worship determined on by the puritans, 454. Plumber's Hall meeting detected, 456. Grindal averse to persecuting, 459.

CHAPTER XIV.

TROUBLES IN THE STATE. — THE PAPISTS BUSY. — ATTEMPTS AT CHURCH REFORMATION. — CARTWRIGHT'S VIEWS. — ELIZABETH'S MORALS. — COURT CORRUPTION.

The league against protestantism — The pope's bull, 462. The papists busy, 463. Douay College and others founded, 464. Open rebellion of the papists, 465. Elizabeth excommunicated, 466. Cartwright's views of church polity, 467. Parliamentary efforts for the puritans, 469. Convocation addressed by Mr. Alcock, 470. New canons against the puritans, 471. Grindal refuses to press them in his province — The queen forbids parliament to meddle with religion, 472. Bitter persecution, 473. Irreligion and immorality abound — The queen's life open to scandal, 476.

CHAPTER XV.

FRUITLESS EFFORTS OF THE PURITANS AT CHURCH REFORMATION AND DISCIPLINE. — ARBITRARY ACTS OF THE QUEEN, 1572–1579.

"An Admonition to Parliament," 479. Cartwright's and Whitgift's antagonistic positions, 480. Wilcox and Field imprisoned for the "Admonition," 481. Cartwright's "Second Admonition," and "Reply to Whitgift's Answer" — Wilcox and Field's confession of faith, 483. Charke's and Deering's views, 487. The exercises, or prophecyings, 488. Scarcity of good ministers, 490. The first presbytery in England, 492. Active per-

secution of puritans, 498. A conformists' prayer meeting broken up, 500. Archbishop Parker dies — Grindal appointed in his place — Whitgift succeeds Grindal, 502. Renewed persecution, 503. Remonstrances, 504. The imperious queen, 505. A new and tyrannical act of parliament, 506. The queen forbids parliament even to petition her for reforms in religion, 507. The consequences of all this tyranny — Open separation from the church of England, 508.



HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

RÉSUMÉ OF ECCLESIASTICAL MATTERS PRIOR TO THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.

In the first volume of this work, Congregational sentiments have been traced through different ages, down to the commencement of the sixteenth century. Before we enter on that most interesting epoch, when the pillars of popery in England were fairly shaken down, and when, among the broken fragments, the fair proportions of a regularly organized Congregational church began to reappear, it may be well to pause, review cursorily the ground over which we have passed, and consider more particularly how stood ecclesiastical matters in England at the commencement of the English Reformation.

The elementary principles of Congregationalism had then been struggling with the despotic powers of popery for more than twelve centuries. The contest, however, had been a most unequal one. Men of humble position, and moderate influence in the world, had been compelled to wrestle "against principalities, against powers, against the

rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." And in the deadly struggle, multitudes had miserably perished by the hands of those who assumed to be "*The* Church," the *true* church, the *only* true church and authorized interpreter of the will of Christ. Churchmen, armed with secular power, had labored hard to trample out and utterly extinguish all such "innovators" and "heretics" as presumed to believe that the Scriptures were a sufficient guide to the essentials of church order as well as Christian faith, and that apostolical simplicity and freedom in the organization and government of the church were alone appropriate and becoming to a Christian people. And the rulers of the corrupt hierarchies of Greece and Rome had repeatedly flattered themselves that they had done their bloody work effectually; that the hated church-reformers were utterly silenced. But in this they wofully deceived themselves; for, though men and women were remorselessly killed, their principles survived. The truth could not be so easily destroyed. Wherever the Word of God was read, sooner or later men arose who insisted on comparing the pompous hierarchy, which was called "the Church," with the apostolic models of the New Testament; and always to the disparagement of the hierarchy. And it is by no means a violent presumption, that, from the rise of the Novatians, about A. D. 250, to the dawn of the English Reformation, about 1527–1530, there were always, in some part of Christen-

dom, witnesses against the hierarchal corruptions of the Greek and Romish churches; men who protested to the death against the various antichristian rites, and ceremonies, and orders, which had been foisted upon the Church.

The ecclesiastical opinions of these men, and the history of their sufferings for conscience' sake, have been given with as much fulness of detail as the scanty materials which have come down to us would allow, or the illustration of their character seemed to require. More especially has this been done for the Lollards, because the prevalence of their opinions, for nearly a century and a half immediately previous to the Reformation, greatly contributed to the success of that gigantic undertaking — the overthrow of the pope's church in England. Though this has been scarcely recognized at all by English historians generally, yet it can hardly be questioned by any one familiar with the ecclesiastical history of the period, that the powerful reformatory impulse given to the English mind by John Wickliffe and his "poor priests" continued to be felt when the first steps were taken by king and parliament towards the reformation of the church of England. Not only did this impulse continue, but there were actually then living in England multitudes of men and women who entertained substantially the same sentiments which Wickliffe and his poor priests proclaimed between the years 1356 and 1384. Indeed, it is by no means certain that there were not in England, in 1530, more intelli-

gent and hearty believers in the essential truths proclaimed by Wickliffe, than there had been at any previous period of English history. Denounced and persecuted by the church as heretics, and for more than a hundred years encompassed with fire, yet the Lollards, like the bush at Horeb, were not consumed. The *name* "Lollard" does not, to be sure, appear so often on the blood-stained records of the episcopal courts of the sixteenth century as it does during the preceding century; but the *thing itself* was there. The very same sort of men and women, persecuted unto death by Arundel and Chicheley, were found in the episcopal dungeons of England, and fed the flames of Smithfield during the early part of the sixteenth century. A proclamation of Henry VIII., in 1525, against "damnable heresies," requires all officers having "governance of the people, to make oath to give their whole power and diligence to put away, and to make utterly to cease, and destroy all manner of heresies and errors commonly called *Lollardies*." * And at a later date, 1536, we find another distinct recognition of the existence of Lollardism, or Wickliffism, in England. In that year there was the most extensive and dangerous insurrection of the commons which Henry's government ever encountered. The king was actually compelled to treat with the popish insurgents, who presented twenty-four articles as the basis of a settlement.

* *Fox's Acts and Monuments*, vol. II. pp. 236, 237.

The first of these read thus: — "I. Touching our faith, to have the heresies of Luther, *Wickliffe*, Huss, Melancthon, Œcolampadius, Bucer's Confessio Germanica, Apologia Melancthonius, the works of Tindal, of Barnes, of Marshal, Baskall, St. Germain, and such other heresies of Anabaptists, clearly within this realm, to be annulled and destroyed." * And at a still later period, 1547, Bishop Gardiner, complaining of certain acts of the people of Portsmouth, in pulling down and defacing images, charges these violences on the *Lollards;* saying that "such as were affected with this principle of breaking down images, were hogs, and worse than hogs, and were ever so taken in England, being called *Lollards*." †

There were, then, men and women in England, by whatever opprobrious names called, who renounced and denounced the entire system of popery. Possessing the New Testament in a language which they understood, they studied diligently, though at the hazard of their lives, its inspired teachings, and yet failed to find any authority for a pope and cardinals, hierarchal archbishops and bishops, an exclusive priesthood, or those various orders of ecclesiastical persons whose ministrations were deemed essential to the maintenance of the hierarchal system. Rejecting the system itself, these dissenters rejected, as a necessary consequence, all the eccle-

* *Froude*, vol. III. pp. 156, 157.

† *Strype's Annals*, vol. II. part I. pp. 53, 54.

siastical laws and constitutions, decrees and bulls, and prohibitory and excommunicatory acts, which emanated from the hierarchy; its holy-days, fasts and feasts; its priestly confessions and absolutions; praying to saints and worshipping images; making pilgrimages, and offerings to the dead; in fact, nearly everything that was peculiar to the Romish establishment. These people not only renounced all the trumpery claims of popery, but insisted that there was only one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus; that repentance towards God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, were the only terms indispensable to salvation; that the congregation of just men constituted the Church of God on earth; that the license of a bishop was by no means necessary to authorize a Christian man to preach the gospel; but that every good man was justified in preaching to his fellowmen, and persuading them to repent and obey the gospel. There were at the beginning of the sixteenth century great numbers of men and women in England who held these and kindred sentiments, which ally them to modern Congregationalists. They were, it is true, for the most part hid beneath the surface of society, from the eyes of the rulers of the hierarchy, as live coals under the ashes, as precious ore in the rocks; still, there were Lollards all over the kingdom — men who heartily believed that the Scriptures were a sovereign and sufficient guide to the order as well as the faith of the Church.

Lambert, *alias* Nicholson, who perished at the stake, November, 1538, held the following opinions on church order and government: — that priests and deacons were the only officers in the primitive churches, and that priests (sometimes called presbyters) and bishops were one; that laymen, and even women, might preach in cases of necessity, and baptize too; and that excommunication ought to be done by the congregation, assembled together with their pastor. He also maintained strenuously the all-sufficiency of the Scriptures, opposed auricular confession, denied the existence of any purgatory beyond this life, rejected the worship of saints, angels, etc., and declared that Christ was the only Mediator between God and man; that pilgrimages, and oblations to dead saints, etc., were not meritorious; that there should be no images in the churches; and that the Holy Scriptures ought to be given to the people in their own tongue. He utterly repudiated the right and authority of the pope to make laws and statutes for the control of Christian men, saying that Peter was no more vicar of Christ than all the apostles.

These sentiments, which are essentially those of the old Lollards, though derived probably directly from the New Testament — Lambert disclaiming any special knowledge of Wickliffe's writings — the martyr said he supposed were held substantially by nearly half of Christendom.*

* "The multitude mounteth well-nigh unto the half of Christen-

The existence of Lollardism in England at this time I know is inconsistent with the assertions of some English historians of good repute. Mr. Froude, for example, the latest and most attractive of the historians of the English Reformation, asserts positively that the Lollards became extinct more than a hundred years before the Reformation commenced. After describing briefly the end of Oldcastle, the Lord Cobham, in 1417, Mr. Froude continues: — "Thus perished Wickliffe's labor — not wholly, because his translation of the Bible still remained a rare treasure, a seed of future life, which would spring again under happier circumstances. But the sect which he organized, the special doctrines which he set himself to teach, after a brief blaze of success, sank into darkness; and no trace remained of Lollardy except the black memory of contempt and hatred with which the

dom." These opinions, and other kindred ones, were drawn out of Lambert by forty-five questions, which Fox tells us were "administered to him" by Archbishop Warham, "about the year 1532, at what time the said Lambert was in custody in the archbishop's house in Oxford, being destitute of all help and furniture of books."

The archbishop died in 1533, before he had got the stake ready for Lambert; and thus for a while the good man escaped. But in 1538, Bishop Gardiner — as bad a man as poor old Warham, and a much more cunning priest — succeeded in getting Lambert into a trap, by inducing him to plead his cause before the imperious Henry VIII., who browbeat and denounced the prisoner to Gardiner's heart's content, and then sent him to the stake. *Fox* gives the particulars of this mock trial, and the questions and answers of a previous date. *Acts and Mons.*, II. 331–355.

heretics of the fourteenth century were remembered by the English people, long after the actual reformation had become the law of the land." *

But, so far is it from being true that "no trace remained of Lollardy except the black memory of contempt," after the execution of Oldcastle, that Lollards may be traced all the way down from Oldcastle's day to the commencement of the English Reformation. They may be traced in acts of parliament, in the inquisitorial records of the bishops, in penance-doing men and women, in the branded cheeks of "heretics," and in the blazing fagots of Smithfield, and many other fields of blood, where Christian men and women testified to their love of "the special doctrines which Wickliffe set himself to teach." And, but for these very Lollards, who are extinguished by the historian with so little ceremony, it is quite doubtful whether the English Reformation could have been effected when it was, and as it was.

The entire history of the efforts of the hierarchy to wear out the dissenting saints by cruel persecutions, and to burn up their doctrines with the bodies of the martyrs of Smithfield, Amersham, Norwich, and other places, shows conclusively the utter failure of these attempts. Archbishop Morton, who died about 1504, left as much work for Warham to do, in suppressing "heretics," as

* *Froude's Hist. Eng. from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth*, II. 24. London, 1836.

Chicheley left to his immediate successors and to Morton. Mr. Soames, in his *History of the Reformation*, in speaking of the Lollards, says:—"The statutory powers with which Henry IV. had consented, for his own ends, to arm the clergy, effectually enabled them to prevent the Lollards from forming a compact and conspicuous body. Persons, however, thus designated, were known to abound in the kingdom. * * * But though these poor Christians were insulated, depressed, and often persecuted, a very small progress, or none at all, seems to have been made towards the extirpation of their opinions. On the contrary, it is evident, from the numerous prosecutions for heresy instituted in the first part of King Henry VIII.'s reign, little disposed as was his minister, Wolsey, towards bigotry, that the party hostile to the church was extensively spread through the country."*

Moreover, Mr. Froude's own history effectually refutes his hasty assertion respecting the sudden extinction of Lollardism. Let the reader turn to the third volume of Froude's history, and under date of June 23d, 1536, (pp. 62–65,) he will find an account of the opening of the convocation of the clergy, and a statement of the heretical opinions which the clergy said were "commonly preached, thought, and spoke" in the country at that time; and of which the historian gives the following summary:—

* Vol. I. p. 157. Lond. 1826.

"After a preface, in which the clergy professed their sincere allegiance to the crown, the renunciation, utter and complete, of the bishop of Rome, and all his usurpations and injustices, the abuses about to be described had, nevertheless, they said, created great disquiet in the realm, and required immediate attention. To the slander of this noble realm, the disquietness of the people, and damage of Christian souls, it was commonly preached, thought, and spoke, that the sacrament of the altar was lightly to be esteemed. Lewd persons were not afraid to say, 'Why should I see the sacring of the high mass? Is it anything but a piece of bread, or a little pretty piece round robin?' Of holy baptism it was said, that 'It was as lawful to baptize in a tub of water at home, or in a ditch by the wayside, as in a font of stone in the church. The water in the font was but a thing conjured.' Priests, again, were thought to have no more authority to minister sacraments than laymen. Extreme unction was not a sacrament at all, and the hallowed oil 'no better than the bishop of Rome's grease and butter.' Confession, absolution, penance, were considered neither necessary nor useful. Confession 'had been invented' (here a stroke was aimed at Latimer) 'to have the secret knowledge of men's hearts, and to pull money out of their purses.' 'It were enough for men to confess their own sins to God in public.' The sinner should allow himself to be a sinner, and sin no more. The priest had no concern with him. Purgatory was a delusion.

The soul went straight from the body to heaven or to hell. Dirige, commendations, masses, suffrages, prayers, alms-deeds, oblations done for the souls departed out of the world, were vain and profitless. All sins were put away through Christ. If there were a place of purgatory, Christ was not yet born. The church was the congregation of good men, and prayer was of the same efficacy in the air as in a church or chapel. The building called the church was made to keep the people from the rain and wind — a place where they might assemble to hear the Word of God. Mass and matins were but a fraud. The saints had no power to help departed souls. To pray to them, or to burn candles before their images, was mere idolatry. The saints could not be mediators. There was one Mediator — Christ. Our Lady was but a woman, 'like a bag of saffron or pepper when the spice was out.' It was as much available to pray to saints 'as to whirl a stone against the wind.' Hallowed water, hallowed bread, hallowed candles, hallowed ashes, were but vanities. 'Priests were like other men, and might marry and have wives like other men.' 'The saying and singing of mass, matins, and even-song, was but roaring, howling, whistling, murmuring, conjuring, and juggling;' and 'the playing of the organs a foolish vanity.' It was enough for a man to believe what was written in the Gospel. Christ's blood was shed for man's redemption, but let him believe in Christ and repent of his sins. Finally, as a special charge against

Cromwell, the convocation declared that these heresies were not only taught by word of mouth, but were set out in books which were printed and published *cum privilegio*, under the apparent sanction of the crown." *

Now let any one compare these representations of doctrines and opinions, common among the peo-

* *Hist. Eng.*, III. 62–65. The paper entire may be found in *Strype's Memorials*, vol. I. part II. No. 78 of Records and Originals. It contains sixty-eight items of erroneous doctrine or practice common in the country at that time, many of which are even more to our purpose than those which Mr. Froude has given. Thus, for example, the clergy say: — "1. That it is commonly preached, thought, and spoken, to the slander of this noble realm, disquietness of the people, damage of Christian souls, not without fear of many other inconveniences and perils, that the sacrament of the altar is not to be esteemed. For divers light and lewd persons be not ashamed or afraid to say, Why should I see the sacring of the high mass? [the celebration of high mass.] Is it anything else but a piece of bread, or *a little predie round robin*? [referring to the shape of the sacramental cakes.] — 2. *Item.* That they deny extreme unction to be any sacrament. — 3. *Item.* That priests have no more authority to minister sacraments than laymen have. — 4. *Item.* That children ought not to be confirmed of the bishop afore they come to age of discretion. — 5. *Item.* That all ceremonies accustomed in the church, which are not clearly expressed in Scripture, must be taken away, because they are men's inventions. — 6. *Item.* That all those are antichrists that do deny laymen the sacrament of the altar *sub utraque specie*. — 7. *Item.* That all those that be present at mass, and do not receive the sacrament with the priests, are not partakers of the said mass. — 8. *Item.* That it is preached and taught that the church that is commonly taken for the church is the old synagogue; and that the church [the true church] is the congregation of good men only. — 9. *Item.* That it is preached against the Litany, and also said, that it was never merry in England since the Litany was ordained, and Sancta Maria, Sancta Katerina, etc., sung and said," etc. See also *Fuller's Church History*, bk. v. sect. 4.

ple of England in 1536, with those said to have been held by the old Lollards of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and it will be seen at once that the very same sort of persons are described or caricatured in both cases.*

Lollardism, then, did exist in England at the dawn of the Reformation. And it is worthy of note that, up to that time, the most efficient, and in fact almost the only earnest protestants against hierarchal errors and corruptions, were the very men who embraced more or less of the principles of Congregationalism, particularly that of the supremacy of the Scriptures.

But these earnest and constant protests were of little avail. The old hierarchy continued its downward course of corruption to the very beginning of this memorable century of reformations. For, while she plucked up with untiring diligence what she was pleased to call the "cockle" and the "darnel" of the English wheat-field, and burned it with unquenchable fire; while she pursued with vindictive malice the Lollards of the kingdom, hunting them to death, for what she was pleased to call their "detestable errors" and "pestiferous heresies" — for claiming the right to read in their own language the sacred Scriptures, and denying the lordly and unscriptural assumptions of popery; while the church of England was diligently doing this work of persecution and death on dissenters, she

* *Froude*, I. chap. VIII. throughout; also pp. 397, 398, 417, 418; chap. XII. pp. 522–524, 527, 528, 552–556, 559, 560.

made no honest, earnest effort to reform her own acknowledged corruptions. During the entire century preceding the English Reformation, though reform was occasionally talked of by the churchmen, and though some of the more conscientious of them complained loudly that it was not attempted, English ecclesiastics, with solitary exceptions, continued shamelessly corrupt in principle and practice.

Public documents, as well as private writings, prove this. For example: in 1425 the commons complained, in a petition to the king, (Henry VI.,) of the shameful neglect by the clergy, of parochial and ministerial duties, and of their non-residence, indolence, avarice, and extortion; that benefices were given to foreigners, who did not reside in England, and would not, and could not take care of the souls committed to them, but contented themselves with exacting and carrying away, to expend abroad, all the pecuniary emoluments of their offices; and the government was warned that the church was thus losing the respect of the people; and, furthermore, that by reason of this corruption of the clergy, and their neglect of their benefices, "the people had fallen into *Lollardies* and heresies."*

But the Bishop of Winchester was then the chancellor of the kingdom and the leading spirit of the cabinet of Henry VI., and he opened the

* See *Rolls of Parliament*, vol. v. (3 Hen. VI.) 290; (4 Hen. VI.) 305, 306; *Turner's Hist. England*, vol. III. pp. 111–113.

very parliament in which these complaints were made, with a bitter invective against heresy and Lollardy. And Henry, as might have been anticipated under the guidance of such ministers, disregarded this prayer of the commons. A quarter of a century later, substantially the same state of things existed in the English Church and State: the people complaining of a negligent, avaricious, persecuting clergy; the clergy resisting all movements towards reform, while they busied themselves in denouncing and punishing the Lollards, the only radical reformers in the kingdom.

A contemporary of those times (Dr. Gascoigne) describes the state of things in his day as deplorable in the extreme. He says, speaking of the insurrection of the people about the year 1450: "Insurrections overflowed against the church and against the king of England, by thousands of men, who said, 'The ecclesiastics destroy us; they live luxuriously on their property, while we are perishing with want; and they have destroyed the king by their flattery or silence.'" These insurgents, the Doctor tells us, complained of "the pluralities of churches, the appropriations in monasteries and collegiate churches, the non-residence of prelates and rectors in their cures, and the unworthy promotion of immoral young men in the church, who, I myself know to be unable to pronounce Latin, and who did not even receive their own revenues, but sent their servants to take and spend them; these evils, and the celebrated proc-

lamantes, destroy the good government of the church, and of souls." *

There appear to have been a few honest and good men among the clergy of that day, who deplored this state of things, and boldly denounced these corruptions in Church and State. But Dr. Gascoigne tells us: "The bad lords and bishops, in 1449 and 1450, declared that the preachers of the Word of God disturbed the people and caused insurrections. Yet these preachers were famous in life and science, and only preached against vices and sins, and against the insatiable cupidity of the king's council, and of the bishops and others, and against the deficiency of public justice, and against the promotion of the very worst persons in the church and public offices." †

Such, substantially, was the state of the church and kingdom during the entire reign of Henry VI., a mild, amiable, well-disposed, but weak man, too much ruled by unprincipled churchmen. The blame is to be laid at the door of the regency

* In *Turner's Hist. Eng.*, III. 89–92. The first seven chapters of Turner (vol. III. bk. III.) on the Middle Ages, abound in illustrations of the hopelessly worldly, corrupt, and abandoned condition of the hierarchy of England at the period which we are now reviewing.

† In *Turner's Hist. Eng.*, Middle Ages, III. 90–95. Lond. 8vo. ed. 1830. Dr. Gascoigne styles himself, "Dr. Theol. and Chancellor of Oxford." He held "a prebend of eight marks in the cathedral of Welles," and in 1445 was appointed rector of St. Peter's, Cornhill, London; but infirmity preventing him from immediately residing in his parish, he resigned the office. He died March 13th, 1450.

during the king's minority, and at that of his council afterwards; the hierarchal element prevailing in both, and the ruling spirit in both bodies for a long time being the king's uncle, the cardinal-bishop of Winchester.*

Although there was less persecution during the reign of Edward IV. than during that of Henry VI., yet the hierarchy remained unimproved; and in 1485 we find one of the clergy deploring the state of the church, and lamenting the hatred of the people towards the clergy, and the eagerness of the common people to insult and abuse them on all convenient occasions. He exhorts his brother clergymen to follow the example of the gospel, and make themselves "good shepherds, not mercenary ones." He says: "There are two kinds of Christians, clergy and laity; but the laymen now harass the clergy." He deplores also the discord among the clergy, and says that "the negligences, ignorances, cupidity, and avarice of the prelates were everywhere inculcated [talked about]; that their judgments, processes, sentences, and decrees were held in contempt; and that the orders of their councils were irreverently disputed (by themselves) before the laity." "These things," he

* The Regency consisted, in 1429, of the Duke of Gloucester; the Bishop of Winchester; Archbishop of Canterbury; Archbishop of York, Chancellor; Bishops of London, of Ely, and of Bath and Wells; Duke of Norfolk; Earl Warwick; Stafford; Lewis Robessart; R. Cromwell; J. C. Scrope; W. Hungerford, Trevener; J. Tiploft. — *Rolls of Parl.*, IV. 344; *Turner*, III. 8.

says, "provoke the laity of our time to attempt such unbridled enormities against the church."* He adds, that there were scarcely ten clergymen in any diocese who did not yearly suffer in their persons or their purses; so great was the general contempt and hatred of the clergy, towards the close of the fifteenth century, occasioned by their idle and vicious lives, oppressions of the people, and cruel persecutions of the Lollards.

There is no evidence of any improvement in the hierarchal clergy during the brief reigns of Edward V. and Richard III., or of any increase of popular favor towards that body. But the clergy had very little opportunity to persecute those who hated and despised them. When, however, Henry VII. had become firmly seated on his throne, the hierarchy, under his fostering care, began again to raise its head, and thrust out its venomous fangs against the poor Lollards, to the prevalence of whose doctrines was attributed all the hatred and contempt of popery which was then cherished by the common people of England.

The principal ministers of the crown during this reign, as during the preceding, were ecclesiastics. Men like Cardinal Morton and Archbishop Warham had now their full swing. And though they improved their power unsparingly, as we have seen in preceding pages, to persecute "heretics," yet

* Quoted from a manuscript discourse prepared to be delivered before the convocation of the prelates and clergy about the time of the death of Edward IV., 1483. — *Turner's Eng.*, III. 365–69.

suffered they the immoralities and abuses of their own hierarchy to fester on to utter corruption.

The moral condition of the national clergy at the beginning of Henry VII.'s reign may be estimated by an act which was passed by his first parliament, in 1485, giving authority to "archbishops, bishops, and other ordinaries having episcopal jurisdiction, to punish and chastise such religious men, being within the bounds of their jurisdiction, as shall be convicted before them, by examination and lawful proof requisite by the law of the church, of adultery, fornication, incest, or other fleshly incontinency, by committing them to ward and prison, there to abide for such time as shall be thought, to their discretion, convenient for the quality and quantity of their trespasses." * Previous to the passage of this act, bishops who had power to arrest laymen on suspicion of heresy, and detain them in prison untried, had no power to imprison priests, though convicted of adultery or incest.

That there was a loud call for the reformation of the clergy at this time is further evident from the charges made against them in their own synod, assembled at St. Paul's, London, by Archbishop Morton, in the second year of Henry VII., and the first of this archbishop's reign, 1487. In this synod complaints were made against the preachers of the order of St. John of Jerusalem, that, in their ser-

* *Statutes of the Realm*, vol. II. pp. 500, 501.

mons at St. Paul's Cross, they inveighed against the vices of the clergy, in the hearing of the laity, who all hated the clergy and delighted to hear their vices exposed.

The prior of St. John was called before the synod, and promised to correct the evil. "The invectives of their preachers, however, do not seem to have been without foundation; for many of the London clergy were accused in this convocation of spending their whole time in taverns and alehouses, of concealing their tonsure and allowing their hair to grow long, and of imitating the laity in their dress. They were severely reprimanded for their enormities." *

Immediately on the adjournment of this synod, the archbishop published a pastoral letter, for the reformation of the lives and habits of his clergy, in which, instead of reproving them for their vices, he charges them "not to wear short liripoops of silk [tippets or tails attached to their hoods, passing round the neck and hanging down before]; nor gowns open before; nor swords; nor daggers; nor embroidered girdles; and to be careful of their tonsures, and to keep their hair always so short that all the world may see their ears; and he threatens them with very severe censures if they do not observe these injunctions"!! †

But neither the exposure of their vices before

* *Henry's Hist. G. Britain*, vol. XII. bk. VI. ch. 2, sect. 1, pp. 2, 3, Lond. 1824; *Wilkins' Concilia*, vol. III. p. 618.

† *Henry*, vol. XII. bk. VI. pp. 2, 3; *Wilkins*, III. 620.

the synod, nor the archbishop's pastoral, seems to have produced much effect on the morals of the clergy; for in 1490 Pope Innocent VIII. addressed a letter to Archbishop Morton, in which his holiness tells the archbishop that he had heard, from sources entitled to confidence, that the monks of all the different orders in England, "giving themselves up to a reprobate sense, led lewd and dissolute lives," etc.; and the archbishop was directed to adopt measures immediately for their reformation. Accordingly he addressed letters to the superiors of all the convents and religious houses in England. To the abbot of St. Albans the archbishop says: "You are infamous for simony, usury, and squandering away the possessions of your monastery, besides other enormous crimes mentioned below." One of these crimes was, that he had made brothels of two nunneries over which he claimed jurisdiction. Another was, that he had stolen the church plate and jewels, and even picked the precious stones out of their patron saint, Alban.*

That this corruption of morals and manners was not confined to the monks, appears from the whole tenor of history. A very significant item in illustration of this is the petition of the gentlemen and farmers of Caernarvonshire, which was presented to the king, Henry VII., complaining of the systematic efforts of the clergy to seduce and corrupt the wives and daughters of the diocese.†

* *Henry*, vol. VII. bk. VI. pp. 3–5; *Wilkins*, III. 630–32.
† *Froude*, I. 84, 85, and note.

The public documents which have now been mentioned prove undeniably the generally vicious and even debased condition of the ecclesiastics who constituted the church of England, down to about the end of the fifteenth century.

And was there any improvement after this date? Did the act of parliament which gave the bishops power to punish their vicious clergy, the reprimand of the synod, the pastoral letters of the archbishop, or the bull of Innocent VIII., — did any or all of these secure the reformation of the English church? No, nor even an honest and vigorous attempt at reform, during the entire reign of Henry VII.

During the first twenty years of the reign of Henry VIII., there was no improvement in the church. The manners and morals of the hierarchy were as corrupt and hateful as they had ever been. So manifest was this corruption, that even Cardinal Wolsey at one time seems to have seriously contemplated a reformation of the church. But its utter debasement probably appalled even him; certainly he was slow to begin a work which he acknowledged to be of the first importance. "Wolsey talked of reformation, but delayed its coming; and in the mean time the persons to be reformed showed no fear. The monasteries grew worse and worse. The people learned only what they could acquire themselves. The consistory courts became more oppressive; pluralities multiplied, and non-residence and profligacy. Favored parish clergy-

men held as many as eight benefices; bishops accumulated sees, and, unable to attend to all, attended to none. Wolsey himself, the church reformer, (so little did he really know what a reformation meant,) was at once Archbishop of York, Bishop of Winchester, of Bath, and of Durham, and Abbot of St. Albans. In Latimer's opinion, even twenty years later, and after no little reform in such matters, there was but one bishop in all England who was ever at his work and ever in his diocese;" and that was the Devil.* Strype, in speaking of this movement of Wolsey, says that "complaints abounded against the manners of the clergy, their oppressions, extortions, and vexations of the laity, as well as against their corrupt and loose lives; the cardinal, to show his resentment of these crimes, as well as the exercise and show of his legatine authority, did, about the year 1523 or 1524, resolve upon a remedy, by a general visitation; and for that purpose, summoned the clergy of both provinces in the kingdom, *ad tractand. de reformatione tum laicorum, tum ecclesiasticorum*, 23 Apr., to appear before him in the church of Westminster."

So delighted was old Fox, Bishop of Winchester, with this scheme of Wolsey's, that he wrote the cardinal that "such a happy day he had now a long time as earnestly desired to see, as Simeon in the Gospel looked for the Messiah's coming."

* *Froude*, I. 88.

He also told him, that for almost three whole years he had been trying to reform his own diocese; but that such was the depravity and corruption and malignancy of the clergy, that he had small hope, in his old age, of seeing a perfect and absolute reformation even in his own private diocese.

Little or nothing, however, came of Wolsey's reformatory scheme. And Strype says: "That no more good came of this commendable purpose of his, to reform the ignorance and vices of the priests and monks, may probably be attributed to their craft in diverting this reformation from themselves, towards those who favored Luther and his doctrines."* Wolsey's reformation ended where his predecessors' had, in a persecution of the only men in the kingdom who heartily desired a true reformation; and there were many such in England in 1527, for "heresy, as it was then called, that is, the Gospel, had already spread considerably in the diocese of London, and especially about Colchester and other parts of Essex, as well as in the city. The New Testament in English, translated by Hotchyn, (that is, Tindal,) was in many hands, and read with great application and joy; the doctrines of the corporeal presence, of worshipping images, and going on pilgrimages to saints, would not down. And they had secret meetings, where they instructed one another out of God's word. Now the cardinal earnestly bestirred himself to put

* *Ecc. Mems.*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 3, pp. 71–74, and pt. II. Appendix, No. 10.

a stop to these things, and to reduce all declining persons to the old way again." * And then began that severe persecution of the poor saints of which some account has been given in the first volume of this work.†

About A. D. 1527, there appeared mysteriously in London "a certain book, entitled 'The Supplication of Beggars,'" which was scattered abroad, and finally came into the king's own hands. This book calls the clergy "ravenous wolves, going in herd's clothing, devouring the flock — bishops, abbots, priors, deacons, archdeacons, suffragans, priests, monks, canons, friars, pardoners, and somners." It sets forth the immense wealth of the clergy, and their "ravenous" exactions, and asserts that "they looked so narrowly upon their profits, that the poor wife must be accountable to them for every tenth egg, or else she getteth not her rights at Easter, and shall be taken as an heretic." And again: "This greedy sort of sturdy, idle, holy thieves," are represented as dissolute to the last degree. "Yea, what do they more? Truly, nothing but apply themselves, by all the sleights they may, to have to do with every man's wife, every man's daughter, every man's maid, that the worst vices should reign over all." And yet, there was no remedy for all this in the courts of the kingdom. "Who is he, though he be grieved very

* *Strype's Ecc. Mems.*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 7, pp. 113–184.

† See vol. I. pp. 546–562.

sore for the murder of his ancestor, the ravishment of his wife, of his daughter; robbery, trespass, maim, debt, or any other offence, dare lay to their [the clergy's] charge by any way of action? And if he do, then is he, by and by, by their wilyness accused of heresy."

This was the popular opinion entertained of the clergy in 1527. And that it was substantially a correct one, we may infer from the reported remark of Henry VIII., who, after hearing the whole petition read, "made a long pause, and then said: 'If a man should pull down an old stone wall, and begin at the lower part, the upper part might chance to fall upon his head'" *— thus broadly intimating that the clergy were the foundations of the rotten old church, and should an attempt be made to reform them, the whole structure would tumble down.

That the "Beggars' Supplication" did not misrepresent the moral condition of the great body of the ecclesiastics of that day, seems quite apparent from the doings of Henry's famous reforming parliament, which assembled November 3d, 1529, and continued its labors for nearly seven years. Read, first of all, the "Act of Accusation" against the clergy, presented by the commons to the king, probably during the first week of the first session of this parliament. In this remarkable document are enumerated "the special, particular griefs" which the commons regarded as "the very chief

* Beggars' Petition, in *Fox*, II. 229–238; *Froude*, I. 179.

fountains, occasions, and causes that daily breedeth and nourisheth the deadly hatred and most uncharitable part-taking" of the clergy and laity against each other. In this act of accusation, the commons complain, first, of the laws, constitutions, and ordinances made by the clergy in their convocations, without the knowledge or consent of the king or of his parliament; and which, nevertheless, they (the laity) were bound to obey, though said laws were never made known to them in the English tongue, or otherwise; of the tyrannical and iniquitous arrangements and management of the archbishop's courts of the "Arches and Audience," where laymen were not only subject to great delay and "importable charges, costs, and expense," but to great injustice; that the king's subjects, and "specially those that be of the poorest sort," were daily called before the spiritual ordinaries, their commissaries, and substitutes, *ex officio*, at the pleasure of the ordinaries — "sometimes for malice, without any cause," sometimes at the suggestion of their summoners and apparitors, being "light and indiscreet persons," without lawful cause of accusation — and there put to great trouble and expense, and often suspended and excommunicated, for small and light causes and on insufficient evidence; of the great and excessive fees taken in the spiritual courts, and especially in the Courts of the Arches and Audience; also, that inferior clergy were allowed to extort money from the laity for the administration of the sacraments

and sacramentals of the church, denying even the sick the sacrament, sometimes, until money had first been paid. In view of all this, the commons pray for a reorganization of the bishops' courts, in accordance with justice, law, equity, and good conscience. They complain, further, of the daily practice of spiritual ordinaries, in giving benefices to "certain young folks [their illegitimate sons],* calling them their *nephews*, or kinsfolk," being minors, and unfit and unable to serve any such benefice; whereby the said ordinaries do keep and detain the fruits or profits of the same benefices in their own hands, while "the poor silly souls," the people, for lack of good curates, perish without doctrine or any good teaching. The number of holy-days appointed by the church is also complained of; "upon the which many great, abominable, and execrable vices, idle and wanton sports, be used and exercised." Great complaint is also made of the spiritual ordinaries, their commissaries and substitutes; that sometimes for their own pleasure, sometimes by the sinister procurement of other spiritual persons, they made out processes against

* A report to Vicar-General Cromwell, respecting the state of morals in the diocese of Hereford, contains the following: "The names of such persons as be permitted to live in adultery and fornication for money." Then follow the names of four vicars, three parsons, one dean, ten knights, and three without titles — in all twenty-one persons; who, it seems, were but a part of the whole number in the diocese; for the report adds: — "With many others of the diocese of Hereford." — State Paper Office, in *Froude's Hist. Eng.*, I. 197, note.

the king's subjects, compelling them to appear before them on a certain day and place, to answer to such articles as might then and there be, *ex officio*, proposed, and that secretly, and not in open places; and then, without making known to the accused the charges to be laid against them, committed them to prison for six months, a year, or more, and finally, when examination had been made and nothing proved against them, dismissed them without recompense and amends for all their cost and suffering. The commons complain, further, that where heresy was laid to the charge of any person arraigned before the bishops' courts, "the ordinaries or their ministers put to them such subtle interrogatories concerning the high mysteries of our faith, as are able quickly to trap a simple, unlearned, or yet well-witted layman without learning; and bring them by such sinister introductions soon to their own confusion." But if the accused denied the charges of heresy, and refused to commit or accuse themselves, "then, for the most part, such witnesses as are brought forth, be they but two in number, ever so sore defamed, of little truth or credence, they shall be allowed and enabled to testify against the accused." *

The commons finally condemn the secularization of the clergy, declaring that many of them were engaged as auditors, bailiffs and stewards; in trade, farming, tanning, brewing, and anything

* Rolls House Manuscript, in *Froude's Hist. Eng.*, I. 188–200.

else but preaching and attending to spiritual duties; while they retained their benefices.*

This picture of ecclesiastical corruption, extortion, and general hatefulness requires no comment; it sufficiently illustrates the condition of "the church," in England, at the dawn of the English Reformation; and that this was not a mere fancy sketch, or the work of the persecuted heretics, the subsequent action of parliament sufficiently shows. Bills were soon presented, and ultimately passed, by which much of the petty extortion and the malicious persecution practised by the "spirituality" was stopped; priests were deprived of their sinecure offices, driven out of their secular trades and money-making employments, compelled to reside in their parishes and benefices; and dispensations for non-residence or other violations of the laws were made penal. At subsequent sessions, the Augean stables of monasticism were cleaned out, and the monks and their concubines and children were driven to honest living or open shame.

The Petition of the clergy of Bangor to the Right Hon. Thomas Cromwell, about the year 1536, furnishes most remarkable and unexceptionable evidence of the horrible corruption of the clergy, and of the estimation in which they were then held. It begins thus: — "May it please your mastership, that when of late we, your poor ora-

* *Froude*, 1. 220, 227.

tors, the clergy of the diocese of Bangor, were visited by the king's visitors and yours, in the which visitation many of us (to knowledge the truth to your mastership) be detected of incontinency, as it appeareth by the visitors' books, and not unworthy, wherefore we humbly submit ourselves unto your mastership's mercy, heartily desiring of you remission, or at leastwise merciful punishment and correction, and also to invent after your discreet wisdom some lawful and godly way for us, your aforesaid orators, that we may maintain and uphold such poor hospitalities as we have done hitherto, most by provision of such women as we have customably kept in our houses. For in case we be compelled to put away such women, according to the injunctions lately given us by the foresaid visitors, then shall we be fain to give up hospitality, to the utter undoing of such servants and families as we daily keep, and to the great loss and harms of the king's subjects, the poor people which were by us relieved to the uttermost of our powers, and we ourselves shall be driven to seek our living at alehouses and taverns, for mansions upon the benefices and vicarages we have none. And as for gentlemen and substantial honest men, for fear of inconvenience, knowing our frailty and accustomed liberty, they will in nowise board us in their houses"!*

What confessions are here! and with what sim-

* MS. State Paper Office, in *Froude*, III. 872.

plicity and straightforwardness are they made! as though all the world knew these things, and it would be an affectation of modesty to make any concealment of them; or rather, perhaps, as though these confessors were utterly lost to the shame and sin of the crimes which they confess, and the abominable reputations which they had earned among all "gentlemen and substantial honest men"!

And even ten years later than this, in 1546, the year before Henry died, and after nearly sixteen years of partial reforming, the work, so far as the mass of the clergy was concerned, was still in a very unsatisfactory state; as appears from what Strype calls "a notable book," which was published that year. It was a sort of counterpart to the "Supplication of Beggars," which appeared in 1527, and was entitled "A Supplication of the Poor Commons to the King." In this, great complaints are made of the conduct and character of the clergy, particularly the monks, whom they call "sturdy beggars"; and who, the king is told, are still busy in fermenting discontent among the people, attributing all that is evil in society to the circulation of the Scriptures in English! "The poor commons," complain loudly of the law then recently passed by the procurement of the clergy, as they say, against the common and poor people having the liberty to read the Scriptures in their houses: "Hath God," they ask, "put immortal souls in none other but such as be possessioners of this world? Did not Christ send word to John

the Baptist, that the *poor* received the Gospel?" And they tell the king, that even when Bibles were ordered to be placed in every church, "many of this wicked generation, as well priests as others their faithful adherents, would pluck it, other into the quire, other else into some pew, where poor men durst not presume to come; yea, there is no small number of churches that hath no Bible at all."

There is much matter of this same character in the "Supplication," showing that there was great uneasiness, among the lower orders particularly, at the oppressive and abusive conduct of the clergy, and especially at their determined efforts to prevent the free circulation of the Scriptures.*

I must not, however, continue these illustrations of the rottenness of the English church during the century immediately preceding the Reformation. These details, which nothing but the importance of the subject could justify a repetition of, more than warrant the complaints and resistance of the Lollards against the hierarchy; and they give a conclusive answer to the denial of the papists and their sympathizers in the episcopal church, of the necessity of the English Reformation. They show us, that, previous to the Reformation, the great English branch of the papal hierarchy was hopelessly, irremediably impure and corrupt; that there was no chance or hope of a radical reformation,

* *Strype's Mems.*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 53, pp. 608–21.

from within; and that nothing remained for the friends of reform, but the adoption of some of the leading opinions and practices of the old, hated, hunted, persecuted, and tormented Lollards: — in a word, that the only way to reform papal corruptions was to overthrow and utterly destroy the papal power. This we shall see, by a subsequent chapter, was finally done; and how it was done.

CHAPTER II.

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.

THE English Reformation was an event of the deepest interest to the Lollards. The night had been long and dreary to them; but the day, at length, dawned. They had sown in tears; but were now to reap in joy. The Reformation was, in fact, a triumph of Lollardism. The doctrines for which Wickliffe was hated and persecuted, and which brought Sautre and Badby, Oldcastle, and a host of others to the stake, came, at length, to be the very faith of the church of England, so far as acts of parliament and clerical conventions could make it such; and the highest dignitaries of that church busied themselves in sowing, broadcast through the land, the identical truths which their predecessors of a previous century had denounced as "cockle in the Lord's field"; which the pope of Rome declared to be "utterly subversive of the church"; and for preaching of which the Lollards were called the "diabolical sons of antichrist." And, what is still more noticeable and wonderful, the very champion of popery, a bitter enemy of the Lollards, and the son of a persecutor of these

same people, became the moving spirit of these great changes! Thus times change; thus men alter; while the truth of God abideth forever.

When, on the 22d of April, 1509, Henry VIII. ascended the throne of England, amidst the rejoicings of a loyal and united people, in the freshness and beauty of early manhood, tall and commanding in person, of easy and pleasing address, accomplished in all the manly exercises of the times, learned for his age, uniting in himself the conflicting claims of the York and Lancaster factions, with a government consolidated by his father's vigorous administration, with overflowing coffers, — what more reasonable, than to anticipate for him a memorable reign! and Henry's reign was memorable; one of the most so in English history. But it was memorable in a way which no one could have anticipated.

Henry's first step in the direction of the Reformation was taken very soon after he came to the throne, by marrying Catharine of Aragon, the widow of his deceased brother, Arthur. That Henry should have taken this step is unaccountable on any other supposition than that a special Providence overruled him. Though Catharine's connections were of the highest order — being the youngest daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella, and aunt of the Emperor Charles V. of Spain; though she brought to the kingdom a very large dowry; and though the alliance with Spain was much desired: yet, there were very strong counterbalancing

objections. The lady was six years older than Henry, and not particularly attractive in person; he had entertained a strong repugnance to the match, and had openly and solemnly protested against the connection; it was contrary to the canon-law, so that the Archbishop of Canterbury and "very many, both cardinals and divines, did oppose it," and a dispensation from the pope became necessary to sanction it; and above all, the old king on his death-bed is said to have become convinced of the illegality of the match, and to have charged his son not to consummate the marriage: yet, so important in a political view was this marriage considered in England, that, in spite of all these objections — any one of which might have been deemed sufficient to prevent it — this marriage between Henry VIII. and Catharine of Aragon took place.*

* *Herbert's Hen. VIII.*, pp. 7, 8. Lond. 1672. *Burnet's History of the Reformation*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. II., Oxford, 1829; and pt. II. *Records*, bk. II. Nos. 1 and 2.

Catharine was married to Prince Arthur, Henry's elder brother, Nov. 14th, 1501; and Arthur died April 2d, 1502. Her dower was the largest that had been given "for many ages with any princess," amounting to 200,000 ducats; which, if silver, was more than equal to as many American dollars; and if gold, to more than twice as many dollars, or to about $480,000. Such a portion was an overwhelming argument with a miser like Henry VII.; and probably not without weight in the mind of one so profuse in his expenditures as was Henry VIII. The pope's bull for the marriage of Henry and Catharine bears date, January, 1503; and Henry's protest, June 27th, 1505. *Froude* says, that a dispensation for this marriage was reluctantly granted by the pope and reluctantly accepted by the English ministry. It was for some time delayed;

This strange union, which was to strengthen and enrich the kingdom, to bind England and Spain indissolubly together, and both kingdoms to the popedom, proved the first link in that mysterious and wonderful chain of circumstances which finally shook England to her centre, incurred the bitter enmity of Spain, cost the English government millions of gold, and finally razed to its foundation the mighty superstructure of Romanism in England.

It was about eighteen years after he had taken his first step, that Henry took his second in the direction of the Reformation; or rather, before his movements began to appear publicly. So mysteriously slow, at times, are the ways of Providence.

During the first eighteen years of Henry's reign, nothing seemed more unlikely than that he should prove the great scourge of Romanism.

and the papal agent was directed to inform the Emperor Ferdinand — who seems to have been as anxious for the match as Henry VII. at first was — that a marriage which was at variance with law and good morals, (*a jure et laudabilibus moribus*) could not be permitted unless on very mature consideration, and for the very best of reasons — *nisi maturo concilio et necessitatis causâ.* — *Hist. Eng.* I. 115.

"His father, Henry VII., who, prompted by his predominant passion, avarice, had formed the scheme, and promoted the contract of that uncommon marriage, was afterwards convinced of its illegality, and endeavored to prevent its accomplishment. With this view he persuaded his son to protest against the contract of his marriage, on the very day he was fourteen years of age, and on his death-bed he charged him with great earnestness never to celebrate that marriage." — *Morison's Apomaxis*, p. 18, in *Henry's Hist. Eng.*, vol. XI. bk. VI. ch. 1, pt. 1, sect. 2, p. 204.

His cruel persecutions of the poor Lollards,* his bitter hatred of Lutheranism, and his bigoted attachment to the old religion, caused him to be regarded as the most important and reliable defender of popery in Europe, and secured for him the title of "Defender of the Faith," and the complimentary present of the "Golden Rose," a token of the special love of his holiness of Rome for his renowned son in Christ, Henry VIII.†

After eighteen years of married life, Henry began to disclose to his confessor and to his confidential advisers his doubts of the lawfulness of his connection with his brother's widow. It has been common to attribute these scruples entirely to his desire to be rid of his old and unattractive wife, that he might marry the young and beautiful Anne Boleyn. But it is certainly more charitable, and quite as reasonable, taking all the circumstances of the case into consideration, to suppose that he really had conscientious scruples on the subject of his marriage; and that these scruples were quickened into principles of action by the continued loss of his children. Passionately desirous of offspring, particularly of male children, to whom the

* See vol. I. pp. 546–62, of this work. *Fox* gives the details of these persecutions. Vol. II. pp. 4–182. See also *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. I. pp. 27–30, and *Fox*, II. 209–69, for details of persecutions between 1527 and 1533.

† *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. I. pp. 18, 19; and pt. II. *Records*, bk. I. No. 2.

crown might be left without the terrible apprehension of a renewal of those civil wars which had been the bane and curse of England for so many years previous to his father's reign, Henry yet saw his offspring, one after another, either stillborn or sinking into premature graves, with a single insignificant exception, the sickly "Lady Mary." It was not unnatural, therefore, for him to look on these events as frowns of Providence on an unlawful, incestuous marriage.*

Whatever may have induced the king to agitate this question of the lawfulness of his marriage, he found his scruples strengthened by a study of the schoolmen, particularly by his favorite, Thomas Aquinas, and also by the opinions of his councillors and others, learned canonists and divines. And after all, it is quite possible that his conscientious scruples may have had an additional strength given to them by the appearance at court, about

* This is *Froude's* view of the matter. *Hist. Eng.*, I. 115–18. *Henry*, the historian, seems to incline to the same view. Vol. XI. bk. VI. ch. 1, p. 204. Froude has collected, from different sources, intimations, or direct assertions, which justify the belief that between June 8d, 1509, and May, 1518, Henry lost, in rapid succession, at least *six* children; three of whom were known to be sons; one of whom lived less than two months, one died immediately after birth, and one was stillborn. Henry himself says: "All such issue, male, as I have received of the queen, died incontinent [immediately] after they were born; so that I doubt the punishment of God in that behalf." The punishment to which he refers is doubtless that alluded to in Leviticus 20: 21. "If a man shall take his brother's wife, it is an unclean thing: * * * they shall be childless."

this time, of a beautiful young lady, whom he soon selected as the successor of the discarded queen.*

The first movement of the king for a divorce, beyond his confessional and privy-council room, appears to have been made in the year 1527, when we find Wolsey travelling about the kingdom, consulting trustworthy dignitaries in Church and State on what he calls "the king's private matier." In the fall of 1527 agents were despatched to Rome to prepare the pope for an application for a divorce, and to decide on "the fittest tools to work by." And on the 5th of December, 1527, Wolsey sent the first despatch to the English ambassador at Rome, Cassali, to proceed in this business "very vigorously and with great diligence"; and laid out for him a plan of operations. The grand end to be sought was, to induce the pope, without con-

* It is difficult to deny that the element of love for Anne Boleyn had something to do with the quickened activity of Henry's conscience just at this time. Cavendish gives a long and circumstantial account of the effort of Wolsey, by the king's command, to break up the engagement between Anne Boleyn and Lord Percy, one of the cardinal's attendants. Though the date of this effort is not given by Cavendish, yet there is good reason to believe that it must have been as early as 1527, possibly even a year earlier. Compare *Cavendish's Life of Wolsey*, pp. 118–34, with pp. 29, 30. See also *Herbert's Life of Hen. VIII.*, 284–87; *Soames's Hist. Reformation*, I. 181–90.

Turner says: "There is not the least evidence" that Anne Boleyn came to England earlier than February, 1527; and in another place: "We cannot now determine the precise date of Henry's regard for this interesting young woman; but there is no evidence that it preceded the spring of 1527." — *Hist. Hen. VIII.*, vol. II. pp. 185, 195. The twenty-first chapter is devoted to Anne Boleyn.

sulting any one, to grant a commission to Cardinal Wolsey, with the assistance of such as his holiness should choose, to proceed forthwith in the examination of the cause; and if the pope would grant this, and such dispensations and bulls as might be necessary to carry out Henry's wishes, the king was ready to promise anything that the holy father might ask.*

The pope, when first approached, expressed his readiness to accede to the king's wishes. But a Spanish agent, probably suspecting what was going on, interfered, and secured the pope's promise, that nothing should be granted to the king, to the prejudice of the queen, without first communicating with the imperialists. And now began a series of manœuvres and counter-manœuvres, promises and breaches of promise, pretences and deceptions, by which the decision of the question was deferred, and the king flattered with hopes, and deceived by his flatterers, promised relief which never came, kept in expectancy only to be cheated, his case neither decided for nor against him; until his patience was exhausted, and all confidence in "the holy father" at Rome and his equally holy consistory was utterly destroyed; and Henry resolved to do for himself what neither patient waiting, free expenditure of money, nor any amount

* *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. I. pp. 90–94; and pt. II. *Records*, bk. II. No. 8, pp. 12–21. See also other despatches for the same general topic — Nos. 4 and 5.

of pains-taking and promise-making could bring the pope to do for him.

All this consumed at least five full years, during which time Henry was pursuing, with undeviating purpose, his one great object — to get divorced from Catharine and married to Anne Boleyn. Still, his measures were so variable and contradictory that no one knew what to depend on. The thing condemned to-day was sanctioned to-morrow; the men in favor one day lost their heads the next day. Thus it was up to the time that Henry took the whole matter of the divorce into his own hands, about 1532–1533.

These years, during which Henry was waiting and hoping for deliverance from Rome, were full of interest to the English protestants, and abounded with incidents of great moment. The Lutheran Reformation had in this time made great progress on the Continent, and exerted a mighty influence on papal England. The spirit of religious inquiry was awakened in both universities, as well as among the parish clergy and the laity throughout the kingdom; and many learned and active men embraced the truth. Such were Bilney, and Garret, and Clark, and Latimer, and Dalaber, and Taverner, and Tyndale, and Fryth. This, of course, was followed by persecutions; for bonds and imprisonment and death were still the price of a good confession of the Gospel. Many protestants escaped into Germany, where they found refuge from their persecutors, and friends to help them. To

make themselves useful to their countrymen, some of the refugees devoted themselves to writing and publishing English books, more particularly the sacred Scriptures. These were smuggled into England in large numbers, hid in bales of goods and boxes of merchandise; and by secret agents were put in circulation through the kingdom. To counteract these heretical doings, and to substantiate his own orthodoxy, in 1529 the king issued a proclamation, "for resisting and withstanding of most damnable heresies sown within this realm, by the disciples of Luther and other heretics, perverters of Christ's religion." After alluding to the fact that "his noble progenitors, kings of this, his said realm, [had] made and enacted many devout laws, statutes, and ordinances, for the maintenance and defence of the said faith against the malicious and wicked sects of heretics and *Lollards;* who by perversion of holy Scripture [did] induce erroneous opinions etc. etc., as well by the corruption and malice of indiscrete preachers, fautors of the said erroneous sects, as by certain heretical and blasphemous books, lately made, and privily sent into this realm" — after thus setting forth the cause of his proclamation, his highness proceeds to order now to be put in execution, with all diligence possible, all good laws, etc., made and ordained by his most noble progenitors, with reference to such matters; and to forbid any man "to preach, teach, or inform anything openly or privily, or compile any book, or hold, exercise, or keep any assemblies or

schools, in any manner of wise, contrary to the Catholic faith, or determination of holy church"; all this under the pains and penalties of those terrible laws which his most noble progenitors had enacted, and which "our sovereign lord and his most honorable council, by long and deliberate advice, for the extirpation, suppressing, and withstanding of the said heresies, * * * thought good and necessary to be put in execution."

Fox says, that, "upon this fierce and terrible proclamation, * * * the bishops, which were the procurers hereof, had that now which they would have; neither did there lack on their part any study unapplied, any stone unremoved, any corner unsearched, for the diligent execution of the same. Whereupon ensued a grievous persecution and slaughter of the faithful. Of whom the first that went to wrack was Thomas Bilney, . . ."* And

* *Acts and Mons.*, II. 236, 237. Bilney's sufferings and death are related by *Fox*, II. 211–28. The martyrologist devotes over thirty of his ample folio pages to accounts of sufferers immediately after the issue of this proclamation, or between 1529-30 and 1533. Vol. II. pp. 237–70. *Collier* says: "It is probable that the publishing of this pamphlet [the "Beggars' Supplication"] with some others of a resembling kind, occasioned the putting out a proclamation against the Lollards, [in 1529,] in which the teaching, preaching, or abetting the opinions of Wickliffe, Luther, or others of that persuasion, are forbidden. * * * Likewise the importing or printing any books contrary to the received doctrines of the church." — *Ecc. Hist. Great Brit.*, vol. IV. p. 184. There are two objections to Collier's suggestions: 1st, That the "Beggars' Supplication" was in circulation about *two years* before this proclamation was issued; 2d, That though Henry knew this, and even

then, having given a long list of sufferers in this persecution, the martyrologist breaks abruptly off with: — "But what stand I here numbering the sand? For, if all the Register Books were sought, it would be an infinite thing to recite all of them, which, through all dioceses of the realm, in these days, before and since, were troubled and pursued for these and such like matters."

On May 24th, 1530, Archbishop Warham published a proclamation against Lollard doctrines; from which we learn, that his grace of Canterbury had taken pains to examine "many books in the English tongue, containing many detestable errors and damnable opinions, printed in countries beyond the sea." These he condemns, with all writers, publishers, and readers of the same, "with the translation also of Scripture, corrupted by William Tyndale, as well in the Old Testament as in the New, and all other books in English containing such errors." *

Fox tells us that Chancellor More, and Bishop Tonstal of London, with others, united in addressing every incumbent in the province, directing them to warn their people against the contagion of heresy,

had the pamphlet read to him, he yet manifested no special dislike to it, simply saying, that, if a man should begin at the bottom, to pull down an old stone wall, he would be likely to have the stones on his head; thus signifying that he understood that the object was to destroy the Romish church, by pulling down the clergy of the church. See *ante*, p. 27.

* *Collier*, IV. 136, 141, 146.

and declaring that it was not necessary that the Scriptures should be set forth in the vulgar tongue. Soon after this, "great trouble and persecution were raised up against the poor innocent flock of Christ."

While these proclamations and inquisitions were doing their appropriate work, in filling the land with sorrow and suffering, other scenes, of great significance, were transpiring in court circles. As the fruit of Henry's expenditures, promises, and threats, he at length obtained from the pope the appointment of a legate, to sit with the English cardinal and try the king's cause in England; and this legate was the king's own choice, Cardinal Campeggio, a shrewd, but profligate and unprincipled man. It was, however, no part of the pope's plan to hurry matters; and Campeggio's bodily infirmities furnished plausible excuses for the greatest possible delay in his journey to London, and for the dilatoriness of his subsequent proceedings. "After a tedious journey, which had been repeatedly suspended by fits of the gout, Campeggio reached London," October 7th, 1528.* On various pretences, the opening of the legates' court was deferred until May 31st, 1529; † and then, the proceed-

* *Lingard*, vol. VI. ch. III. p. 141: "In such a state of suffering and weakness, that he was carried in a litter to his lodgings, where he remained several days confined to his bed."

† *Lingard* says: "Delays were sought and created, not by the pontiff, but by the king himself." — VI. 144. It would require very strong evidence to satisfy any impartial mind that this was

ings were carefully prolonged by repeated adjournments and other devices, until July 23d, when, instead of giving judgment, as the king and his courtiers expected, the court adjourned until October, that the whole proceedings might be laid before the pontiff. This greatly exasperated the king, and, though doubtless in entire accordance with the Roman legate's instructions, proved a fatal stroke to Wolsey, who soon began to experience the effects of the king's suspicions that he had been false to him. Campeggio left for Rome about the first of October; and before the close of that month, Wolsey was indicted for a violation of the statute of 16 Richard II., called the statute of *Præmunire* — for obtaining bulls from Rome and exercising legatine powers in England. To this indictment the cardinal pleaded ignorance of the statute, and submitted himself to the king's pleasure. The great seal was taken from him; he was put out of the king's protection; his goods and chattels, which were immense, were declared forfeited to the king, and his person liable to be seized. Henry had not yet, it would seem, fully resolved on the utter destruction of his old favorite. He intended to humble Wolsey, and to frighten the Roman court, if possible; but not to cut off all hope. Accordingly, on the 27th of

true. Henry was in a fever of anxiety to have this question of divorce adjusted; and as he had great confidence, at first, that it would be done to his mind by this court, why should he wish to delay the work?

November, the king granted Wolsey his protection, and then his pardon, restored his bishopric of Winchester and his archbishopric of York, and also gave him back more than six thousand pounds in money, goods, and plate. On this, the cardinal retired to Yorkshire, and there spent some of his most consistent and respectable days, in the duties and charities of a Christian bishop. After the expiration of about a year, the king, finding that the Roman court was not much troubled by Wolsey's fall, resolved to bring him yet lower; and on the 4th of November, 1530, he was suddenly arrested, at Cawood, in Yorkshire, on the charge of high treason, and committed to the lieutenant of the Tower, to be brought to London. On the way the poor man sickened, and finally died, November 28th, 1530, of disease and a broken heart.*

Wolsey seems to have anticipated most serious consequences to himself in the event of Henry's failure at Rome. The earnestness of his letters to Rome, and his appeals to the pope, show this, unless, perchance, he was a more consummate hypocrite than even Clement VII. himself. Nevertheless, it is quite clear that Henry suspected Wolsey. Lord Herbert tells us that "the king believed that, underhand, he had intelligence with the pope, to the prejudice of his affairs. * * * This also, I believe, was confirmed in the king's mind, by some

* *Burnet*, vol. i. pt. i. bk. ii. p. 164; *Lingard*, vol. vi. ch. iii. pp. 152-64; *Cavendish's Life of Wolsey*, p. 868; *Herbert's Life of Henry VIII.*, p. 284.

notice he might have of a joint despatch (a minute whereof is extant in our records) from Wolsey and Campegus, during their session, whereby they desired the pope to avoke the cause, in case it grew so doubtful that they could not determine it." And he quotes Polydore Virgil as saying that Wolsey "wrote privately to the pope, to suspend the cause until they could bring the king to some better mind." But Polydore Virgil, though contemporaneous with these times, is indifferent authority for any statement of fact; and Wolsey's dying words seem to contradict the presumption of treachery against the king:—"Then shall his conscience [the king's] declare whether I have offended him or no." *

* *Lord Herbert's Life and Reign of Henry VIII.*, p. 284.

The story of Wolsey's fall, and particularly of the fatal journey which he undertook by the king's order, is told quaintly, but most effectively, by the cardinal's faithful friend and servant, George Cavendish, his "gentleman usher," who attended him to the last, and records his dying language: "'Well, well, master Kingston,' quoth he, [addressing the king's messenger, who had been sent to attend him to London,] 'I see the matter against me, how it is framed; but, if I had served God as diligently as I have done the king, he would not have given me over in my gray hairs. Howbeit this is the just reward that I must receive for my worldly diligence and pains that I have had to do him service; only to satisfy his vain pleasure, not regarding my godly duty. Wherefore I pray you, with all my heart, to have me most humbly commended unto his royal majesty; beseeching him, in my behalf, to call to his most gracious remembrance all matters proceeding between him and me, from the beginning of the world unto this day, and the progress of the same; and most chiefly in the weighty matter now depending;' (meaning the matter newly begun between him and good Queen Katherine;) 'then shall his

The pope improved the time wasted by his legates in playing with Henry's case in London, by patching up a league of friendship, so called, with the faithless Charles V.; and was prepared, at the close of the legates' farce, to take the whole matter out of his agents' hands and forbid them from further hearing the cause. Herbert tells us, that when Campeggio, on his return to Rome, represented to the pope the great danger into which his course had drawn Cardinal Wolsey, he gave no special heed to the matter, seeming to care for nothing so much as the conserving of his late league with the emperor; and further, suggests that the pope secretly hated Wolsey, and was not particularly troubled to have him brought down.*

Soon after the dissolution of the legatine court, a new direction was given to the king's thoughts, and an essential modification to all his operations, by the casual suggestion of Dr. Cranmer, after-

conscience declare whether I have offended him or no.'" — *Cavendish's Life of Cardinal Wolsey*, pp. 387, 888. On another occasion, Wolsey said to the Earl of Shrewsbury: "My lord, there is no man alive or dead that looketh in this face of mine, is able to accuse me of any disloyalty towards the king." — *Cavendish*, p. 863. The story of Wolsey's fall begins page 246.

Turner says: "It was discovered that he [Wolsey] was forming conspiracies against the government, both in England and with Rome." — *Hist. Henry VIII.*, vol. II. p. 297. Turner's authorities for this statement seem to me, however, to go no further than that the cardinal was *accused* of such conspiracies. But it is one thing to accuse a man of crimes, and quite another to prove those accusations.

* *Life of Henry VIII.*, p. 289.

wards the celebrated Archbishop of Canterbury. This learned and good man, happening to fall into conversation with two gentlemen, Gardiner and Fox, who were about the king's person, in answer to an inquiry respecting his notion of the divorce, declined giving an opinion on the question itself, but suggested that the shortest and best way to clear the matter would be to ascertain the opinions of learned men on the questions, whether, by the Word of God, the marriage was in itself lawful? and if unlawful, whether the pope could dispense with the law of God? He suggested, that, if the learned men and the universities of Christendom should decide — as he evidently thought they would — that it was contrary to the law of God for a man to marry his deceased brother's wife; and that no pope had power to sanction what the law of God forbade; then must the pope of necessity give judgment in favor of the king. The conversation being reported to the king, he was immediately struck with Cranmer's suggestions, and declaring that "he had the sow by the right ear" at last, ordered him to court, adopted his proposal, and sent at once to the learned divines and canonists and universities of Europe for their opinions on the two questions: — 1. Whether it was agreeable to the law of God for a man to marry his brother's wife? and 2. Whether the pope could dispense with the law of God?

The year 1529, already made memorable by the explosion of the legates' mock court, the fall of

Wolsey, and the adoption of a measure which in effect settled the question of the king's divorce and the onward progress of the Reformation, was made still further memorable by the coming together of the long, or reforming parliament. There had been no session of parliament for some years previous, and but one for fourteen years. Wolsey had a wholesome fear of parliaments, and chose to carry on the government with as little interference from them as possible. There was a parliament in 1515, which sat forty days, from November 12th to December 22d; and another was not called until April 15th, 1523, which was prorogued on the 21st of May, to July 31st, and was dissolved August 15th.

But the great cardinal, and the absolute and all-powerful minister, having now fallen into disgrace, the king assembled a parliament, November 3d, 1529, which he found so compliant, and so efficient in carrying on his schemes for humbling the clergy, frightening the pope, and finally overturning popery itself, that he kept it alive for about six years! *

Three bills, of great interest and importance touching the Reformation, were originated by the commons; and, notwithstanding the earnest opposition of the clergy within and without parliament,

* *Burnet* says: "There had been great industry used in carrying elections for the parliament, and they were so successful that the king was resolved to continue it for some time." — Vol. I. pt. I. bk. II. p. 169. *Hall* says: "The most parte of the commons were the kynges servantes." — *Chronicle*, p. 767.

were triumphantly passed, the king "setting them forward," as Burnet says. The first of these bills struck at the exorbitant charges of the spiritual courts for the probate of wills, "at the which," says Hall, "the archbishop of Cauntorburie in especiall, and all other bishoppes in generall both frowned and grunted, for that touched their proffite." This bill sets forth, "that divers ordinaries [ecclesiastical judges] take for the probation of testaments and other things thereunto belonging, sometimes forty shillings and sometimes sixty shillings, and sometimes more, against right and justice; where, in the time of Edward III., men were wont to pay for such causes but two shillings sixpence, or five shillings at the most." It was therefore enacted, that "for the probate of wills etc., the charge should only be what it was in the days of Edward III." * Another bill regulated, and

* Forty, or even sixty shillings does not strike a modern reader as a very exorbitant probate charge; but when it is remembered that the value of gold and silver was nearly or quite *six times* greater in the days of Henry VIII. than it now is, and that the clergy had advanced their charges from twelve to sixteen times what they were in the days of Edward III., it will be seen at once that these charges were not only grievous to the common people, but were a strong illustration of the avaricious disposition of those who had the regulation of these matters.

Hall gives a spirited account of the debates of parliament on these bills. He says: "Sir Henry Guilford, knight of the garter, and comptroller of the king's house, declared in the open parliament, on his fidelity, that he and other, being executors to Sir William Compton, knight, paid for the probate of his will to the cardinal and the archbishop of Canterbury, *a thousand marks sterling*," (about $3220.) — *Chronicle*, pp. 765–68. 4to ed. Lond. 1809.

reduced essentially, the heavy fees of the clergy, which had long been the instruments of extortion, and had occasioned great complaints; though the people were afraid of incurring the fate of Hunne if they openly resisted these iniquitous claims of the spirituality.* A third bill struck at other crying abominations of the times — the plurality of benefices, and non-residence, and also the secularization of the clergy, in pursuing for profit various trades and employments; for the clergy had become extensively secularized in their character and work, as we have seen by previous quotations from petitions to parliament.†

These bills were adapted to bring down the power and influence of the clergy, and to alarm the pope; and were strenuously resisted by the clergy to the very last. Bishop Fisher, in the upper house, declared that these bills had "no other intent or purpose but to bring the clergy in contempt with the laity, that they may seize their patrimony"; and he warned the lords, "Beware of yourselves and your country; beware of your holy mother, the Catholic church; the people are subject to novelties, and Lutherism spreads itself among us. Remember Germany and Bohemia, what miseries are befallen them already; and let our neighbors' houses, that are now on fire, teach us to beware of our own disasters. Wherefore,

* *Statutes of the Realm*, 21 Hen. VIII. chaps. 5 and 6.

† *Statutes of the Realm*, 21 Henry VIII. chaps. 5, 6, 13; *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. II. p. 165; *Fox*, II. 207; *ante*, p. 30.

my lords, I will tell you plainly what I think: that, except ye resist manfully by your authorities this violent heap of mischiefs offered by the commons, you shall see all obedience first drawn from the clergy, and secondly from yourselves; and if you search into the true causes of all these mischiefs which reign amongst them, you shall find that they all arise through want of faith." * Resistance, however, was in vain. The bills passed.

The year 1530 was devoted to negotiations and efforts of various kinds, having reference to the divorce; particularly were Henry's agents busy in all directions, collecting the opinions of learned men, canonists and divines, on the lawfulness of the king's marriage, and the power of the pope to dispense with the law of God.

"If we sum up the result of Cranmer's measure as a whole, it may be said, that opinions had been given by about half of Europe, directly or indirectly, unfavorable to the papal claims." † Nineteen universities gave an opinion against the lawfulness of a marriage between a brother and a brother's widow.‡ It is a noticeable fact, however, that the English universities gave their opinion in favor of the king with great reluctance. Oxford had the matter under discussion nearly two months

* *Parliamentary History*, vol. III. pp. 57, 58. Lond. 1762, second edition.

† *Froude*, I. 267.

‡ *Burnet's Hist. Ref.*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. II. pp. 171–85; pt. II. *Records*, bk. II. Nos. 34 and 35.

— from February 12th, to April 8th, 1530. And it was necessary that the corporation should be quickened by several "messages" from the king, before the needful opinion could be obtained. At Cambridge, when the question was first submitted to the congregation, there was a tie vote; and it would seem that the majority vote could not finally be obtained without some management on the part of the king's agents; for Fox and Gardiner, who were then at Cambridge to expedite the business, wrote to the king, that, "at the last, by labor of friends, to cause some to depart the house, that were against it, [that is, who were opposed to the king's wishes,] it was obtained." *

And, though the unbiased opinion of the great majority of learned men of that period, canonists and divines, Lutheran and Romish, doubtless was against such marriages as Henry's, yet the influences brought to bear on their minds were so many and powerful, that it is difficult to say how much weight should be given to their published opinion. The Lutherans, we may reasonably believe, were honest; for though they held the pope as "the abomination of desolation," yet they cannot be suspected of any special friendliness towards the royal champion of Romanism against Lutheranism, who was even at that very time denouncing and persecuting the friends of Luther, and had just issued a special proclamation against the books and

* *Hist. Ref.*, vol. I. pt. II. bk. II. No. 32; pt. I. p. 178.

the persons of the protestants. Bribery of various kinds was freely employed by all parties to secure favorable opinions. Money was given, and emoluments and offices were promised and granted. Thus Dr. Crook, one of Henry's agents in Venice, writes, under date of July 1st, 1530: — "Albeit, gracious lord, if that I had in time been sufficiently furnished with money — albeit I have besides this seal [the sealed opinion of the university of Padua] procured unto your highness an hundred and ten subscriptions: — yet it had been nothing in comparison of that, that I might easily and would have done." It is true, that this same agent, in another letter, says: "Upon pain of my head, if the contrary be proved, I never gave any man one halfpenny *before* I had his conclusion to your highness, without former prayer, or promise of reward for the same." Still, he gave, though generally small sums, a crown or two to an individual, and to convents, etc., more. The emperor of Spain, on the other side, "did reward and fee divines at another rate," says Burnet. To one who wrote in favor of the validity of the marriage, he gave a benefice worth five hundred ducats a year; to another, a benefice worth six hundred crowns; and to the provincial of the Gray Friars, at Venice, one thousand ducats were offered if he would inhibit all within his province from writing or subscribing for the king.*

* *Hist. Ref.*, vol. i. pt. ii. bk. ii. No. 38; pt. i. p. 180.

That Henry's agents were as ready to bid for influence as were those of Charles and Catharine appears from the bargain made by Dr. Bennet, Henry's agent at Rome, with the cardinal of Ravenna. This influential old cardinal made a written bargain to help the king, if he would give him a benefice in France, worth six thousand ducats a year, and the very first vacant bishopric in England.* The letter of "Secretary Knight" to Cardinal Wolsey, dated January 1st, 1527-28, giving an account of the first opening of the king's matter to the pope, shows the same disposition. Knight tells Wolsey, that, perceiving that much depended on the advice of the Cardinal *Sanctorum Quatuor*, he had desired the cardinal "to be good and favorable with our requests in the king's behalf; and for the better obtaining of our desires, we promised to see unto him with a competent reward." † And in the first despatch of Wolsey to Sir Gregory Cassali, Henry's ordinary ambassador at Rome, in relation to the divorce, we read: "And because money was like to be the most powerful argument, especially to men impoverished by a captivity [the pope had recently been made a captive by the armies of Charles V.], *one thousand ducats* were remitted to Venice, to be distributed as the king's affairs required; and he [Cassali] was to make farther promises as he saw cause for it,

* *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. II. p. 243.

† *Burnet's Records*, vol. I. pt. II. bk. II. No. 4.

which the king would faithfully make good; and in particular, they were to be wanting in nothing that might absolutely engage the Cardinal Dotary to favor the king's business." *

Thus, by means fair or foul, by threats or promises, by money, or by other inducements, the opinions of a very large number of learned canonists and divines, and of most of the principal universities of Christendom, were obtained in support of the view taken by Henry and his councillors of the unlawfulness of his marriage with Catharine, and the invalidity of the papal bull in dispensing with what they called "the law of God." And these opinions greatly strengthened the king in the position he had taken, exerted a powerful influence on the nation and on Europe generally, and without doubt encouraged the subsequent bold steps of Henry against the pope. These opinions were laid before the pope, and were enforced by an earnest letter from a large number of English lords, spiritual and temporal; in which they told his holiness, that "the king's cause was now, in the opinions of the learned men and universities, both in England, France, and Italy, found just; which ought to prevail so far with the pope, that though none moved in it, and notwithstanding any contradiction, he ought to confirm their judgment; especially it touching a king and kingdom to whom he was so

* *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. II. pp. 90, 104; and pt. II. *Records*, bk. II. No. 8, also No. 9.

much obliged; * * * and if the pope would still refuse to do this, they must conclude that they were abandoned by him, and so seek for other remedies. This they most earnestly prayed him to prevent, since they did not desire to go to extremities, till there was no more to be hoped for at his hands." *

On the 16th of January, 1530-31, there was another session of parliament. At this session all the testimonies of the universities, and the books and opinions of learned men, which had been so carefully collected against the lawfulness of Henry's marriage with Catharine, and the power of the pope to allow the marriage, were presented. The same testimonies were laid before the convocation of the clergy, then in session; and the clergy, Burnet says, "seemed satisfied that the marriage was unlawful, and that the bull authorizing it was of no force." † In being thus compliant, the clergy

* *Burnet* says this letter was signed by the cardinal, Wolsey, the archbishop of Canterbury, Warham, four bishops, two dukes, two marquises, thirteen earls, two viscounts, twenty-three barons, twenty-two abbots, and eleven commoners, most of them being the king's servants.—Vol. I. pt. I. bk. II. p. 192. The letter, with the names of the signers attached, is given, and Clement's reply in full, in *Parl. Hist. Eng.*, III. 68–79.

† "But now the session of parliament came on the 16th of January, and there the king first brought into the house of lords the determination of the universities, and the books that were written for his cause, by foreigners. After they were read and considered there, the lord chancellor did, on the 20th of March, with twelve lords, both of the spirituality and temporality, go down to the house of commons, and showed them what the universities

may have had an eye forward to the evil day which threatened to break upon them, when they would find themselves entirely in the king's hands, and at his mercy. A few words will explain this: there had for centuries been going on a fitful, irregular contest between the kings of England and the bishops of Rome respecting their mutual rights. The popes claimed, and gradually succeeded in exercising, a power over the clergy of England, which was considered by energetic monarchs incompatible with the rights of the sovereign and the interests of the people. Against these claims certain laws had been made, from time to time, limiting the power of the pope, and making all recognition of his right to this sovereign power in England punishable by fines, forfeitures, imprisonment, and being put out of the king's protection. These laws were called, in general terms, the "Statute of Præmunire" and the "Statute of Provisors." The first of these statutes was passed as early as the days of Edward I., A. D. 1272–1307. It was con-

and learned men beyond sea had written for the divorce, and produced twelve original papers, with the seals of the universities to them, which Sir Briam Tuke took out of his hand, and read openly in the house, translating the Latin into English. Then about an hundred books, written by foreign divines for the divorce, were also showed them; none of which were read, but put off to another time, it being late. * * * The matter was also brought before the convocation; and they having weighed on both sides, seemed satisfied that the marriage was unlawful, and that the bull was of no force; more not being required at that time." — *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. II. pp. 213, 214.

firmed and strengthened by successive parliaments, down to the times of Richard II. and Henry IV. Yet the pope never yielded what he had once claimed, and continued to exercise his usurped authority whenever he could. And such was the condition of most English kings, from the days of Edward I. to Henry VII., that the statutes of Provisors and Præmunire were but little attended to; and the popes generally had very much their own old way in England. Still, the laws were on the statute-book; and now Henry VIII. resolved to apply them as a scourge, to drive the clergy into his own darling schemes. Having first killed poor Wolsey by the application of these long quiescent statutes, he next proceeded to apply them to the clergy generally. Wolsey had received bulls from Rome, and had exercised legatine authority in England; all which was against law: and the clergy had recognized this legatine authority, and appeared in his court, and done business there; which were equally against the statutes of Provisors and Præmunire: and "they were, therefore, with the great offender, also, at the king's mercy. He could put them out of his protection, confiscate all their property, and imprison their persons. This they understood; and, fully aware of the unmerciful character of the king when his own ends were to be answered, they were only too happy to escape the full infliction of this whip of scorpions by compliance with the royal wishes in other things. On this condition, they were let off with

a fine; the province of Canterbury paying one hundred thousand, and York eighteen thousand eight hundred and forty pounds. And it was while under this rod of correction that the convocation first addressed Henry VIII. as "The Protector and Supreme Head of the Church and Clergy of England" — a title which he claimed from them, and which was subsequently confirmed by an act of parliament.*

The several acts and transactions of the king and parliament and convocation, which have now been mentioned, were certainly sufficiently admonitory of the temper of the king, and indicative of his power over parliament and convocation. But the pope would not receive the admonition. He trusted to the usual devices of the Roman court to counteract and defeat all these unfriendly doings; or he hoped that some happy turn in affairs would make everything right again between England and Rome. Clement was indeed in a difficult position. A man destitute of principle, of decision of character, and of all manly qualities, who trusted to temporary expedients, rather than to honest, straightforward purposes — placed between the powerful and unscrupulous emperor, Charles V.,

* *Statutes*, 22 Hen. VIII. ch. 15; *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. II. pp. 214–28.

The statute of Præmunire, according to Burnet, was so called from the leading word in the statute: "In writs of *præmunire facias*," etc. — *Statutes*, 7 Richard II. chap. 14. There is a very good summary account of these statutes of Provisors and Præmunire in Dobson's old Encyclopædia, art. *Præmunire*.

and the arrogant and determined king, Henry VIII. — sure to offend, mortally, one of these men if he openly sided with the other, and liable to be ground to powder between them — what could have been expected of Clement VII. but that he should flatter and lie, and seek to cheat both parties; that he should shuffle and manœuvre to avoid either horn of the dilemma which threatened his own destruction, while it imperilled the peace and unity of the whole Romish church? He would gladly have given Henry a bill of divorce. It was no great affair, in itself considered; but he was afraid of Charles V., who had warmly espoused the cause of his aunt, Catharine. And yet, Henry and the English nation were too valuable to the papacy to be lightly cast aside. He seems, however, finally to have concluded that there was less danger from "the Defender of the Faith," and the "patient ass," which England had long been to Rome, than from the unscrupulous and powerful emperor. So, while he flattered Henry with delusive hopes, he gratified Charles with a refusal of any definite answer to Henry's prayer.

But the pope was mistaken in reckoning on the faith and forbearance of Henry and his people; for, at the next session of the parliament, which met on the 15th of January, 1531-32, several bills were introduced, which struck more directly at the pope's power and influence than any that had preceded them. The first act of the commons was

to enter a complaint against the clergy, and to petition the king to protect his subjects from the violent and unlawful proceedings of the spiritual courts, particularly the practice of the bishops in calling men before them *ex officio*, without any accuser, and laying charges against them which must either be abjured, or expose the accused to the stake.

An act for restraining the payment of "*annates*, or first fruits, to the court of Rome," which had been "extorted by restraint of bulls and other writs," was also passed by this parliament. By annates was meant the income for one year of the see of a deceased bishop or archbishop, which the pope exacted from the successor before he was allowed to enter fully upon that see. These exactions, which the parliament say "were founded on no law," had carried out of the kingdom daily, "great and inestimable" sums of money, chiefly in coin, "which, from the second year of King Henry VII., to that present time [1532], amounted to eight hundred thousand ducats," or, in sterling money, to at least *eightscore thousand pounds*, "besides other great and intolerable sums." It was a grievous tax on the bishops, and sometimes ruinous to their friends, when the new bishop happened to die soon after entering upon his see. This act was passed conditionally, that, if the pope would moderate the payment of annates, the king might annul this act.*

* *Statutes of the Realm*, 23 Hen. VIII. ch. 20, sect. 4; *Burnet*, vol.

These doings of the king and parliament alarmed the pope, touching as they did his income — his most tender point — and he sought to stop the progress of defection by a letter to the king, and by a new citation of his majesty to Rome to answer to Catharine's appeal. But the king refused to appear, either himself or by proxy, anywhere out of his own kingdom. When the pope expostulated with Henry's agents about this act, he was told that it was still in the king's power, and except the pope provoked the king, it would not be put into execution. The pope and his consistory were at this time in great commotion, and knew not what to do. Faction, intrigue, and bribery were all rife in Rome. But nothing was done to heal the breach between Henry and the pope, England and Rome.*

While the doings of the English parliament were certainly antipapistical and revolutionary, the popular feeling far outran the parliament in that direction. This appeared, among other ways, in the disposition to attack and destroy images and crucifixes in the highways, and even in the churches. During the years 1531 and 1532, many of these idols were thrown down, burned, or otherwise destroyed. Among others, there was a very famous "idol," Fox tells us, "named 'the Rood, of Dover Court,' whereunto was much and great resort of

1. pt. 1. bk. 11. pp. 237–39; *Froude*, 1. 826–48. This act was ratified by the king's letters patent, July 9th, 1534.

* *Burnet, ut sup.*

people." It stood in a church, and the church-door was kept open day and night, to give credit to the lying pretence that no man could shut that door. Four protestants, thinking to test the power of the idol, travelled one night some ten miles to the church, took down the idol and burned it to ashes. For this piece of constructive sacrilege, they were all indicted of felony, and three of them hanged.*

Though individual offenders against popery were thus severely dealt with, the king and his parliament kept steadily at work, breaking, one after another, the cords which bound the nation to the papal throne. In 1532, the king called the attention of parliament to the contradiction between the oaths of the clergy to him and to the pope. The unsatisfactory answer of the clergy to the complaint of the commons, relative to the spiritual courts, was also brought to the notice of parliament; and only the sudden adjournment of both houses, on the 14th of May, in consequence of the appearance of the plague in London, prevented immediate and decisive action on these matters.

While affairs in England were becoming more and more unsatisfactory to the Romish party and their infallible head, and negotiations between Henry and the pope were in progress — if that can be called progress which includes no advance — the four great sovereigns of Europe, the Pope,

* *Fox*, II. 250.

the Emperor Charles V., Francis I., and Henry VIII., were diligently negotiating with each other, or rather, plotting and counterplotting against each other. Clement's desire was to unite the emperor and Francis to himself against Henry. If he could do this, he would be more than a match for Henry, powerful as he confessedly was; for Henry's subjects were divided in religious opinions, and a recent rebellion among them was only half smothered, and England had a bitter and watchful enemy in Scotland, who only wanted an opportunity to attack her.

But a union between the three arch-liars of Christendom, Clement VII., Charles V., and Francis I., was not an easy thing to effect. Several times it appeared nearly consummated. But each of these knaves believed his fellow to be as corrupt as he knew himself to be, and as ready to break his solemn pledge to his fellow-sovereigns, if a sufficient inducement was offered. And then, Henry, if not quite as dishonest as either of the quartette, was quite as shrewd and politic; so, when he found the pope, the emperor, and the king of France drawing dangerously near each other, he was ready to adopt almost any measure, however unpalatable to himself, to separate them. A favorite expedient was, to threaten to make a protestant league with the Lutheran princes of Germany. This idea Henry liked only a very little better than did the pope and the emperor. He would have much preferred a catholic union to suppress protestantism,

if that could have been made to answer his purposes just as well. But he knew that Charles, Clement, and Francis hated the thought of a protestant union even worse than he did, and dreaded it withal; and they saw that it was so manifestly for his interest, and for the interests of the German princes, to form such a league, that nothing was so much feared by them. This was specially true of the emperor and the pope. And Francis, if less alarmed by this threat than they were, yet appreciated fully the importance of using it to help on his favorite schemes of personal aggrandizement. His game was, to play off Henry against the emperor, with the pope; and against the pope, with the emperor; both of whom, next to a protestant league, most feared a league between Henry and Francis; for together they would have been too much for Clement and Charles. And so there was a constant bidding and manœuvring between these crowned rogues — Henry bidding for Francis against the pope and the emperor; Francis bidding for Henry against the emperor and the pope; and the emperor and the pope bidding for Francis against Henry and the German protestants.

In the summer of 1532, Henry at last succeeded in making a league, offensive and defensive, with Francis I. of France; and in October, the two monarchs met to talk over matters, and to concert plans for the future. This interview is of special interest to those who would trace the successive

steps of the Reformation; because there is reason to believe that it decided Henry's course in a very important particular. Anne Boleyn accompanied the king to France, and was received, and tacitly recognized by Francis as the chosen queen of England. Thus Francis openly and unequivocally committed himself to Henry, in his great quarrel with the pope. At this interview, Francis advised Henry to bring his protracted divorce-suit to a close by marrying Anne Boleyn at once; and solemnly bound himself to the English monarch, to stand by him should the pope interdict his kingdom, excommunicate him, and attempt to dethrone him.*

On returning to England, Henry waited about three months, and then proceeded to act on the advice of Francis, and was married to Anne Boleyn, privately, on the 25th of January, 1532-33, by Rowland Lee, afterwards Bishop of Coventry and Litchfield. This was not made public for several months. And during all the time the parties interested were busily engaged with the divorce question, but with substantially the same results as had marked its history for some six years previously.

During this year another very important step was taken towards the Reformation, by the appointment of Thomas Cranmer to the see of Canterbury, made vacant by the death of Warham, in August, 1532. The consecration took place March 13th, 1532-33.†

* *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. II. pp. 252–55; *Froude*, I. 870–80.

† *Burnet*, *ut sup.* p. 258; *Froude*, I. 898.

On the 23d of May following, another still more important step was taken: the archbishop of Canterbury, after due process, pronounced sentence of divorce against Catharine; and thus finished, without the pope's help, this protracted, vexatious, expensive, and distracting business, which had now kept Europe in commotion for six weary years.*

Why the divorce was not made to precede the marriage, it may not now be possible to decide. Perhaps Henry had not fully determined how to treat Catharine, when he married Anne. The pope, or those believed to know his views and feelings on the subject, had repeatedly intimated, that a dispensation might be easily obtained from the Roman court, authorizing Henry to have *two* wives;† and it is by no means incredible that Henry might have been in doubt, for a time, whether or not to avail himself of such a dispensation. The fact that he did not, favors the supposition that he really had conscientious scruples in regard to the lawfulness of his first marriage.‡

* *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. II. p. 265; *Froude*, I. 379, 392.

† *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. II. p. 98; and pt. II. bk. II. No. 6; *Froude*, I. 379. "Marry freely," the pope had said, at the outset of the discussion; "fear nothing, and all shall be arranged as you desire." "Multo minus scandalosum fuisset dispensare cum majesta vestrâ super duabus uxoribus, quam ea cedare quæ ego petebam," is the reported language of Clement to one of Henry's agents who was pressing the pope for a divorce, about 1532.—*Froude*, I. 398–400, comp'd with p. 133. See also *Herbert's Life of Henry VIII.*, p. 330.

‡ Cranmer was charged with having solemnized the marriage

Another session of parliament commenced February 4th, 1532-33. At this session an additional wedge was driven into the split between England and Rome, by the passage of an act prohibiting all appeals to Rome, and declaring that all causes, spiritual as well as temporal, whether relating to the king or any of his subjects, were to be determined within the kingdom, in the several courts to which they respectively belonged, notwithstanding any appeals to Rome, or inhibitions and bulls from Rome to the contrary.* This act was doubtless designed to fortify the position of Henry in refusing to appear at Rome, by himself or proxy, to support his petition for a divorce, and to cut off Catharine's appeal to Rome against the archbishop's decision. It also forestalled all papal interference with the laws of the kingdom or the

of Henry and Anne Boleyn; and *Burnet* (I. 126) says he was present. But in his letter to Hawkins, Cranmer says distinctly: "I myself knew not thereof a fortnight after it was done." He also settles the time of the marriage, saying that it took place "muche about St. Paul's day," (January 25,) in the year 1532, old style. See *Cranmer's Works*, Parker Society's edition, vol. II. p. 246. *Burnet* says, that the marriage took place on the 14th of November, 1532, and charges *Stowe* with saying, "without any good ground, that it was on the 25th of January." The correctness of Stowe's statement, however, is verified by Cranmer's words, and is now, I believe, admitted by the best historical authorities. See particularly *Ellis' Original Letters illustrative of English History*, 2d series, vol. II. let. 114, pp. 33–40, where may be found Cranmer's letter entire, giving an account of the marriage and coronation of Anne.

* *Statutes*, 24 Henry VIII. ch. 12; *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. II. p. 256.

acts of the convocation, past or prospective. It was, therefore, a most important and significant act. By it England was declared, in effect, complete in herself for all purposes of government, spiritual as well as temporal, and absolutely independent in all respects of Rome. The same act also provides against the anticipated interdict of the kingdom. It declares, that "all spiritual prelates, pastors, ministers, and curates within this realm, shall and may use, minister, and execute, and do, or cause to be used, ministered, executed, and done, all sacraments, sacramentals, divine services, and all other things, within the said realm and dominions, unto all the subjects of the same, * * * any former citations, processes, inhibitions, suspensions, interdictions, excommunications, or appeals, for, or touching of, the causes aforesaid, from, or to the see of Rome, or any other foreign prince or foreign courts, to the lett or contrary thereof in any wise notwithstanding." *

Thus the king armed himself and his subjects at all points against the sovereign pontiff, and fortified his kingdom against the threatened invasion from the papists.

At Rome, the announcement of the marriage and divorce produced a most profound sensation. Some of the cardinals, in their wrath, were for proceeding at once to a definitive sentence against Henry. But others saw that it would be folly to

* *Statutes*, 24 Henry VIII. ch. 12.

do that before the pope was in a position to enforce the sentence — knowing full well that the effective weapons of Rome in this case must be, not spiritual, but carnal; and that with the league existing between Henry and Francis, nothing effectual could be done. They feared, too, that by driving matters to an issue prematurely, France as well as England might be lost to Rome; for Francis was known to be quite inclined to limit, if not to abolish entirely the papal power in his own kingdom. The Roman court, therefore, wisely contented itself, at first, with declaring the proceedings of the archbishop of Canterbury, in the matter of the divorce, null; and warning Henry of his *exposure* to excommunication, unless he immediately restored things *in integrum* — to the precise state they were in prior to the divorce. The king appealed from this decision of the pope to the next general council lawfully called. This put Clement into a great passion.*

The next step taken by the papal court was, to break the league between Henry and Francis. To do this, the pope allowed Francis almost to dictate his own terms. Among other things, the pope engaged to give his niece, the afterwards infamous Catherine de' Medici, in marriage to the Duke of Orleans, with a marriage portion of one hundred thousand crowns, together with the principality of many Italian towns. He also conceded to the

* *Herbert*, pp. 385–89; *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. II. pp. 265–78.

king all the relief from papal exactions that he asked; and "did also grant him so great power over his own clergy, that he could scarce have expected more if he had set up a patriarch in France." Anything to break the dreadful league between Francis and Henry! And Francis was just honest enough thus to join hands with the pope, in violation of his vows to Henry. The simple, but all-sufficient reason for this was, that he thought his own ends could then be better answered by a Roman league than by an English one. Still, he talked of standing by Henry in the matter of the divorce, and of exerting his best offices with the pope, on behalf of the English monarch. He even had a secret article in his treaty with his holiness, which pledged the pope to yield to Henry's wishes for a divorce, if the appeal to a general council was withdrawn and the case was once more submitted to the decision of the Roman court. And Francis labored most earnestly to persuade the king to accept the pope's proposition. For a while, Henry utterly refused, but at length consented; and there is good authority for thinking that only the providential delay of his courier for two days, on his way to Rome with his master's assent to the arrangement, prevented the breach between England and Rome from being finally bridged over, and the Reformation stopped.*

* *Burnet, ut sup.; Herbert*, pp. 395–97; *Froude*, II. 150–55; 184, 187; 212–20. *Lingard* calls this entire statement in question. He doubts whether any time was fixed for the arrival of

But, whether the vacillating, deceiving, weak and wicked head of the Romish church, and his corrupt cardinals, would not have found some excuse for further delay, or for falsifying the pope's own word by deciding against the king, even had the courier arrived in season, cannot be told except by Him who knoweth the secrets of men's hearts. It was not, however, the purpose of Heaven that the breach between the pontiff and the king of England should be healed; and on the 23d of March, 1533-34, the Roman consistory decided

this courier, and whether any change would have been made by his earlier arrival, in the decision of the consistory; and he says, further: "It is certain that the answer brought by the courier was unfavorable; because all the actions of Henry about the time when he [the courier from England] was despatched, prove a determination to separate entirely from the papal communion." — *Hist. Eng.*, vol. VI. ch. III. p. 203.

Lingard's reasoning, though by no means conclusive — for stranger things than this were done by Henry and those who did his bidding — is not without considerable force. Every one who considers the doings of the parliament which was in session during the very time that the king's business was before the consistory of Rome for final decision, and even while this important courier was on his way to Rome with (as it is said) the king's submission of the case to the Roman court again — every one who considers these things must feel that the whole course of parliamentary proceedings is utterly inconsistent with the thought of submission to Rome, or any reconciliation whatever. The king and parliament breathe only war and utter defiance. So forcibly did this strike my own mind, even before I had seen Lingard's suggestion, that I at first supposed that the session must have been *after* the papal decision had reached England. See a brief outline of these noticeable proceedings on subsequent pages of this work — pp. 81–84.

against Henry, by a vote of *nineteen* cardinals to *three;* and the pope was constrained to pass sentence against the king. His marriage with Catharine was pronounced valid and lawful; the proceedings against her in the archbishop's court were condemned; and the king was ordered to take her back, as his only legitimate wife.

Some five months later than this, Pope Paul, who had succeeded Clement, finally prepared his terrible bull against Henry.* "In this extraordinary instrument, in which care was taken to embody every prohibitory and vindictive clause invented by the most aspiring of his predecessors, the pontiff, having first enumerated the offences of the king against the apostolic see, allows him ninety, his fautors and abettors sixty days, to repent and appear at Rome in person or by attorney; and then, in case of default, pronounces him and them excommunicated; deprives him of his crown; declares his children by Anne, and their children by their legitimate wives, incapable of inheriting for several generations; interdicts his and their lands and possessions; requires all clerical and monastic bodies to retire out of Henry's territories; absolves his subjects and their tenants from the oaths of allegiance and fidelity; commands them to take up arms against their former sovereign and lords; dissolves all treaties and alliances between Henry and other powers, as far as they may be contradictory

* Clement's bull, dated March 23d, 1534-[5], may be found in *Fox*, II. 536.

to this sentence; forbids all foreign nations to trade with his dominions; and exhorts them to capture the goods, and make prisoners of the persons, of all such as still adhere to him in his schism and rebellion." *

"But Paul cast his eyes on the state of Europe, and when he reflected, that Charles and Francis, the only princes who could attempt to carry the bull into execution, were, from their rivalry of each other, more eager to court the friendship, than to risk the enmity of the king of England, he repented of his precipitancy. To publish the bull could only irritate Henry, and bring the papal authority into contempt and derision. It was, therefore, resolved to suppress it for a time; and this weapon, destined to punish the apostasy of the king, was silently deposited in the papal armory, to be brought forth on some future opportunity when it might be wielded with less danger and with greater probability of success." †

When the great insurrection in the north occurred, in the autumn of 1536, it was thought that the fit time had come for its publication. But other councils even then prevailed, and it was still kept back. But two years later, when Europe was alive with horror at some of Henry's terrible executions, particularly those of the Marquess of Exeter, Lord Montague, and the old Countess of Salisbury, their mother, of the Marchioness of Exeter,

* *Bullarium Romanum*, vol. i. p. 704, ed. 1673.
† *Bullar. Rom.*, i. 708; *Lingard*, vi. 225.

and other distinguished personages, some of whom were nearly allied to the king by blood — when these distinguished nobles were executed, in 1538, it was thought suitable to proclaim the pope's bull.* But I am anticipating.

This decision of the Roman consistory, and all these papal threats, once so terrible to rulers and their subjects, had no other effect on Henry than to rouse him effectually for the unavoidable conflict. Parleying and negotiating were now at an end; all saw that now his only alternative was abject submission to papal authority, or a manly, desperate fight for absolute independence — for the utter overthrow and abolition of the papal power in England. Henry, without a moment's hesitation, wisely and bravely chose to fight out his quarrel to the end; and by this time the body of the nation was pretty well prepared for the great contest. The parliament, which met January 15th, 1533-34, and adjourned March 30th, resumed with energy the work of reform. A bishop preached every Sunday during the session, at St. Paul's, against the authority of the pope, declaring that

* *Lingard*, vol. VI. ch. III. pp. 202, 225, 226; *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. II. pp. 185, 186; and pt. II. *Records*, bk. III. No. 9. The Sentence of Pope Paul III. — "*Damnatio et Excommunicatio Henrice VIII., Regis Angliæ*" — bears date, "Anno Incarnationis Domini 1535, 8 Kal. Sep., Pont. nostri anno 1." Attached to this is another bull, whose title reads thus: "Sequitur Suspensio Executionis dictæ Bullæ, et tandem ejus Revocatio, et Executio"; and which bears date, A. D. "1538, decimo sexto Kal. Januarii, Pontificatus nostri anno quinto."

he had no authority *at all* in England: a doctrine never before taught by the State clergy in the kingdom, though proclaimed by the Lollards at the peril of their lives, for more than a hundred and fifty years previous to this date. "In the two former sessions," says Burnet, "the bishops had preached, that the general council was above the pope; but now they struck a note higher. This was done to let the people see what justice and reason there was in the acts that were then passing." These acts were very important: one, which passed March 20th, provided that "the intolerable exactions for Peter-pence, provisions, pensions, and bulls of all sorts"—in fact, all payments whatever to "the apostolic chamber"—should at once cease, under the pains and penalties of the statutes of Provisors and Præmunire. And the power heretofore exercised by the pope over religious houses was transferred to the king.* Another act confirmed the doings of the archbishop of Canterbury in divorcing Catharine, and established and con-

* *Statutes*, 25 Hen. VIII. ch. 21. The right to annul, repeal, and make void any of the provisions of this very damaging act was left in the king's hands, as was the act of 1531-32, ch. 20, against annates, until the feast of the nativity of St. John the Baptist, or June 24th. The king gave his assent to the act after the decision of the Romish consistory was known in England, April 7th, 1534. See *ante*, p. 67; *Statutes*, *ut sup.* sect. 22. "Peter-pence" was an assessment of *one penny* on every housekeeper who owned property worth thirty pence *per annum*, or every house having a chimney. It was due on the festival of St. Peter *ad vincula*, or August 1st. It is said to have been first instituted by King Iva, about A. D. 720.

firmed the king's marriage with Anne Boleyn; declaring her children the legitimate heirs of the kingdom, and requiring all subjects to be sworn to this effect, at the will of the king.* The same parliament, on the 28th of March, passed an act repealing the bloody law of the 2 Henry IV. against heretics; and so far mollifying those of Richard II. and Henry V. against the Lollards, as to require that heretics should only be proceeded against upon presentments, and by two witnesses at least, the accused having the privilege of answering in open court, instead of the secret chambers of the bishops; and giving him the right of bail after being committed to prison. It also provided, that no man should be troubled upon any of the pope's canons or laws, or for speaking or doing anything against them: a most gratifying limitation of the power of the clergy, as well as of the pope, and an effectual relief of the people from the vexatious persecutions to which they had long been exposed.†

This parliament, also, after reiterating the act for restraining the payment of annates and other claims of the pope, further enacted that no archbishop or bishop should be presented, nominated, or commended to the bishop of Rome, "otherwise called the pope," or should obtain "any manner of bulls, breves, palls, or other things requisite for an

* *Statutes*, 25 Hen. VIII. ch. 22.

† *Statutes*, 25 Hen. VIII. ch. 14. For some account of the old statutes which were repealed or modified by this act, see *ante*, vol. I. pp. 341–45; 382–85; 361–67.

archbishop or bishop, nor pay any sums of money for annates, first fruits, or otherwise, for expedition of such bulls, breves, or palls"; and provided, that archbishops and bishops should be elected by the deans and chapters, or priors and convents, under a license of the king; or in default of such election, should be presented by his letters patent. The act also directed how the consecration should be conducted.*

Thus was England's independency of the pope most emphatically asserted, and the needful provision made for carrying on all ecclesiastical affairs within the kingdom without any aid from Rome. And yet it is observable, as illustrating the temper of the times, that in this long and severe act, in which the ecclesiastical independence of the realm is most distinctly asserted, in which all payments of every kind to Rome are prohibited, and all appeals and suits to the Roman court are cut off, under the pains and penalties of a *præmunire*, and all ecclesiastical, as well as civil authority is declared to be in the kingdom, without any recourse to Rome — in this very act there is this remarkable clause: "Provided, always, that this act, nor any thing or things therein contained, shall be hereafter interpreted or explained, that your grace, your nobles and subjects intend by the same to decline or vary from the congregation of Christ's church, in any things concerning the very articles of the Cath-

* *Statutes*, 25 Hen. VIII. ch. 20.

olic faith of Christendom; or in any other things declared by the holy Scripture and the Word of God necessary for your and their salvation." *

A long act of attainder was passed by this parliament against Elizabeth Barton, the "Maid of Kent," and her clerical accomplices, Bocking, Deering, Rich, Risby, Goold, and Maister, who, by "feigned and dissembled revelations, traitorously conspired against our said sovereign lord * * * to the intent traitorously to destroy our said sovereign lord, and to deprive him and his lawful succession from the crown and dignity royal of this realm," etc. etc.†

Bishop Fisher and Ex-Chancellor More were concerned in this extraordinary and impudent cheat; but were let off without serious difficulty, though possibly their connection with this popish soothsayer, if not their actual complicity in the plot, may have been remembered against them when they refused to take the oath of succession to the crown, which was tendered soon after the adjournment of parliament.

A still more noticeable act was passed by the convocation of the clergy which sat during the session of this parliament. In this act the clergy acknowledged that all their convocations ought to be assembled by the king's writ; and promised, "*in verbo sacerdotii*," that they would never make

* *Statutes*, 25 Hen. VIII. ch. 21, sect. 18.

† *Statutes*, vol. III. 25 Hen. VIII. ch. 12; *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. II. p. 302.

nor execute any canons or constitutions without the royal assent to them, and that measures should be taken to reform or abrogate all existing canons which were prejudicial to the king's prerogative, contrary to the laws of the land, and heavy to the subjects. All this was confirmed by an act of parliament.*

The above were the principal reformatory acts of this celebrated parliament and convocation. With a strong hand did the king thus drive on the herculean work of demolishing the papal fortresses in England: not without opposition and resistance from the popish clergy, however, but in spite of all resistance; for Henry VIII. was not a man to quail before opposition, nor to allow his own imperious will to be effectually resisted in his own kingdom.

What is more remarkable than any reformatory act of parliament, or convocation even, was the fact that the very monks, the *élite* of the Romish host, were also induced to renounce the pope's supremacy, and to swear allegiance to Henry as the head of the church of England; and to promise submission to him, notwithstanding the pope's censures; who, they were made to say, had no more authority or jurisdiction than any other bishop, beyond the limits of his own diocese.†

* *Statutes*, 25 Hen. VIII. ch. 19; *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. II. p. 299.

† *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. II. p. 314. In the *Records*, vol. I. pt. II. bk. II. No. 50, may be found what is declared, by the priors of

In addition to these several acts, by which the pope's authority was officially and legally overthrown in England, the press and the pulpit were assiduously used for the same purpose. The pope's name was struck out of all the service-books of the church; books were published, and preachers were required constantly to preach, against the pope's supremacy, and in favor of the king's; and instructions were sent to all the sheriffs to keep a vigilant eye on the clergy everywhere, to see that they were faithful to the king in these matters; and still further, spies were sent out by Cromwell, who was now (1534) at the head of the government next to the king, to watch the clergy and the sheriffs, with orders to report all delinquencies to the government.

Thus were the tables completely turned on the papists. The time was, when the spies of the clergy were everywhere, to detect the poor men and women who ventured to speak or act in opposition to the usurped authority of the bishop of Rome; and when all officers of state were required, by

six religious houses, to be *the free and unconstrained* opinion and assent of themselves and all the brethren of their respective houses — "uno ore et voce, atque unanime omnium et singulorum consensu et assensu," etc. In this document they say of the king: "Rex noster Henricus est caput ecclesiæ Anglicanæ"; and of the pope: "Quod episcopus Romanus, qui in suis bullis papæ nomen usurpat, et summi pontificis principatum sibi arrogat, nihilo majoris neque auctoritatis aut jurisdictionis habendus sit, quam cæteri quivis episcopi in Anglia alibi in sua cujusque diocese."

royal authority, to aid the clergy to their utmost in bringing the heretic Lollards to the stake. But now, the king, the parliament, and the convocation even, proclaim as the doctrine of the church of England and the law of the state, the very truths for which the Lollards died; and spies are everywhere watching the clergy and the state officials, to see that they are faithful to these Lollard doctrines!

Even a cursory reader of the history of the English Reformation must be impressed with the conviction that wise and far-reaching minds were employed in shaping the public acts of this period, and minds pretty thoroughly protestantized too. These acts appear generally to have been carefully matured, and skilfully adjusted to the circumstances of the country in its new position towards popery. Thomas Cromwell, chancellor of the kingdom, and Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, were the directing spirits of the Reformation; and most diligently must they have labored in maturing and carrying forward the important measures which characterize those stirring times. A glance at the minutes of the privy council will show that the utmost pains were taken to prepare the minds of the people for the new measures, and to set them forward in the best possible manner. Take the following memoranda of subjects to be considered, or work to be done, by the privy council, at a meeting on December 2d, 1534: — 1. That all the bishops were to be sent for and

examined apart, whether they by the law of God could prove that he who is called the pope of Rome is above the general council, or *that* above him; or whether he hath given to him, by the law of God, any more authority within the realm than any other foreign bishop. — 2. To devise with all the bishops, to set forth and preach to the king's people, that a general council is above the bishop of Rome, and all bishops, and that the bishop of Rome hath no more authority in this realm than any other foreign bishop, and that his exercise of authority heretofore in the realm has been usurped, and only by sufferance of the princes of the realm. — 3. That order be taken to have this doctrine preached every Sunday at St. Paul's Cross; and that the bishop of London suffer no other doctrine to be preached at St. Paul's. — 4. That all the bishops of the realm be bound and ordered to preach this same doctrine throughout all their dioceses. — 5. That special practice be made, and also a straight commandment given, to all provincials, ministers, and rulers of all the four orders of friars within this realm, that they cause the same doctrine to be preached by all the preachers of their religion through the whole realm. — 6. To practise with all the friars Observantes, and to command them to preach in like manner. — 7. That every abbot, friar, and other heads of religious houses, shall in like manner teach convents and brethren to teach and declare the same. — 8. That every bishop shall make special command-

ment to all his clergy to preach in like manner. — 9. Proclamation to be made throughout the realm of the act against appeals to Rome.

The above is a sample of the minutes. There is much more of similar import, showing what painstaking every step in the great reformation required from the men who directed the affairs of Church and State in those eventful days.*

In November and December of 1534, there was another session of parliament, which, though quite short — from the third of November to the eighteenth of December — was yet a most important session; for in it was passed the act which established by law the right and title which Henry had previously extorted from the clergy — that of "Supreme Head of the Church of England."

This act is short, and for its importance deserves to be given entire, as on it is built the whole fabric of the present church of England. It is entitled: "An Act concerning the King's Highness, to be Supreme Head of the Church of England, and to have authority to reform and redress all errors, heresies, and abuses in the same"; and reads thus: "Albeit the king's majesty justly and rightfully is and ought to be [oweth to be] the supreme head of the church of England, and so is recognized by the clergy of this realm in their convocations; yet, nevertheless, for corroboration and confirmation thereof, and for increase of virtue in Christ's relig-

* *State Papers*, vol. I. pt. II. No. 20, pp. 411–14.

ion within this realm of England, and to repress and extirpate all errors, heresies, and other enormities and abuses heretofore used in the same: Be it enacted by authority of this present parliament, that the king our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall be taken, accepted, and reported the only supreme head in earth of the church of England, called *Anglicana ecclesia*, and shall have and enjoy annexed and united to the imperial crown of this realm, as well the title and style thereof, as all honors, dignities, preëminences, jurisdictions, privileges, authorities, immunities, profits, and commodities to the said dignity of supreme head of the same church belonging and appertaining; and that our said sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall have full power and authority, from time to time, to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend, all such errors, heresies, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, whatsoever they be, which by any manner, spiritual authority, or jurisdiction ought or may lawfully be reformed, repressed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained, or amended, most to the pleasure of Almighty God, the increase of virtue in Christ's religion, and for the conservation of the peace, unity, and tranquillity of this realm: any usage, custom, foreign laws, foreign authority, prescription, or any other thing or things to the contrary hereof notwithstanding." *

* *Statutes*, 26 Henry VIII. ch. 1, anno 1534.

In this session, likewise, an act was passed reciting and ratifying the oath of obedience to the king and his heirs by Queen Anne, required by the statute 25 Henry VIII. ch. 22, sect. 9;* and another act, granting to the king and his heirs the payment of the first fruits, heretofore given to the pope, and the yearly tenths of all spiritual livings;† and still another, making it high treason, and taking away all sanctuaries from persons who should "wish, will, or desire, by words or writing, or by craft imagine, invent, practise, or attempt any bodily harm to the king's most royal person, the queen's, or their heirs apparent, or to deprive them of the dignity, title, and name of their royal estates, or slanderously and maliciously publish and pronounce, by express writing or words, that the king our sovereign lord, should be heretic, schismatic, tyrant, infidel, usurper of the crown."‡

This parliament further proceeded at once to a practical application of the principles established by previous acts in reference to the appointment and institution of bishops, by making provision for the nomination and consecration of twenty-six new suffragan bishops.§ It likewise passed acts of attainder against Fisher, bishop of Rochester, and Sir Thomas More, ex-chancellor of the kingdom, and several others, for refusing to take the oath relating to the succession of the crown.‖

* *Statutes*, 26 Henry VIII. ch. 2. † *Ib.* ch. 8.
‡ *Ib.* ch. 13. § *Ib.* ch. 14. ‖ *Ib.* chaps. 22 and 23.

CHAPTER III.

PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION. — THE FIRST ENTIRE BIBLE IN ENGLISH PRINTED. — SUBSEQUENT ISSUES OF THE SCRIPTURES IN ENGLISH.

THE years 1535–1541 were filled with transactions and events of deep moment to the Reformation. In 1535 the memorable visitation of the monasteries began. These "religious houses" were found to be, generally, cages of unclean birds or beasts, and the lesser ones were suppressed in 1536, and the greater ones in 1539.* In 1535, also, fell those great props of popery, Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More.† Another of the signs of the

* *Statutes of the Realm*, 27 Henry VIII. chaps. 27 and 28; and 31 Henry VIII. ch. 18; *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. III. pp. 388, 445; *Fuller's Church History*, bk. VI.; *Froude's Hist. Eng.*, vol. II. ch. X.

† *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. II. p. 321.

Fox calls More, "a bitter persecutor of good men." — *Acts and Mons.*, II. 293, 294. *Froude's* account of More and Fisher is very full and graphic, in vol. II. ch. IX. For examples of More's cruel and persecuting temper, see particularly pp. 72–88, and 229. *Burnet* says of More: "He was one of the bitterest enemies of the new preachers, not without great cruelty when he came into power, though he was otherwise a very good-natured man." — Vol. I. pt. I. bk. I. p. 32.

It is but common justice to his memory to add, that More ex-

times was the appearance, by royal authority, of "A Goodly Prymer" in the English language,

pressly denied having perpetrated some of the specific acts of cruelty which were charged on him. Lewis, in his preface to Roper's Life of More, states fairly the charges against More, and gives the best answers made to these by him and his friends. He does not, however, attempt to exonerate him from the charge of harsh treatment of the persons of those reformers who fell into his hands, and of vituperative and scurrilous language when speaking of them. Singer, in his preface to Sir Thomas More's life, says: "The only serious and unrefuted charge which can be brought against his [More's] memory, is the severity of misguided zeal with which he sought out and punished the early reformers, whom he unrelentingly persecuted with the pen and scourge, as pernicious heretics." Bishop Atterbury says of More's Latin answer to Luther, that in it he had forgotten himself so far that he had there "thrown out the greatest heap of nasty language that perhaps ever was put together," and that "the book throughout is nothing but downright ribaldry, without a grain of reason to support it, and gave the author no other reputation but that of having the best knack of any man in Europe at calling bad names in good Latin; though his passion is sometimes so strong upon him, that he sacrifices even his beloved purity to it."

Tyndale's Doctrinal Treatises, and his answer to Sir Thomas More's *Dialogue*, etc., abound in illustrations of the violent and even scurrilous language commonly used by More in speaking to or of the reformers, and of his persecuting spirit towards all of them within his reach. — *Parker Society's Publications.* *Fox* furnishes an illustration of More's special hatred of Tyndale. He tells us, that More, having any poor man before him who had been at Antwerp, where Tyndale was supposed to be, employed in translating the Scriptures and in other labors of love, "most studiously would search and examine all things belonging to Tyndale: where and with whom he hosted; whereabout stood the house; what was his stature; in what apparel he went; what resort he had," etc. — *Acts and Mons.*, II. 803. The fruits of this bitter enmity finally ripened into the betrayal and death of the good man, by the hands of a pretended friend, introduced from

commonly called the "King's Primer," and characterized by its generally evangelical character, and by its bold attacks on the cherished dogmas and practices of the Romish church. In this primer the popes are called "the cursed and wicked bishops of Rome, that heretofore have been and are but lies and vanities." The saying of prayers before images or pictures is condemned, as involving, in some instances, "the most highest blasphemy and shameful villany that can be devised to the merits of the most precious death and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ." Praying to saints and the Virgin Mary, if not condemned with all the pointedness that image-worship is, is yet treated as unnecessary, and not required by the Scriptures. Jesus Christ is spoken of throughout this primer as "our only sufficient and eternal Mediator"; and

England, after being hunted from place to place for years. Any one who would understand what pains were taken, and what sums of money were expended by the English government, to stop the labors of Tyndale and to bring his life to an untimely end, should read the biographical sketch of the great translator which prefaces *Tyndale's Doctrinal Treatises*, in the Parker Society's Publications; or *Fox's* Story of Tyndale, II. 301–8; or, above all, *Anderson's Annals of the English Bible*. A very able and comprehensive review of Sir Thomas More's life and character may be found in No. 59 of the *North British Review*. It was republished in *Littell's Living Age*, No. 776. More seems to have sympathized with the church reformers until about the time of the Anabaptist outbreak and insurrection in Germany. The radicalism of those reformers probably alarmed him, and made him fear for the safety of the State, if the new doctrine prevailed.

the popish substitution of the Virgin, in place of her Son, as vile idolatry. Praying for the dead is denounced and ridiculed, "as amongst all other works of darkness and deep ignorance, not one of the least." *

The year 1535 is specially memorable for the appearance in print of the first entire English Bible. Wickliffe's translation had been circulating, very secretly, in manuscript, for more than a hundred and fifty years, or since about 1380, when he began the work; Tyndale's translation of the New Testament had been finding its way, for nine or ten years, all over England,† prohibited and con-

* See the "Admonition to the Reader," introductory to the Primer, in *Formularies of Faith;* Preface to the Litany, *ib.;* and "Admonition and Warning," which precedes the "Dirige," *ib.*

"From 1534 to 1539, this primer must have been extensively circulated; for another edition was required in 1538. Though but a small volume, yet it accomplished a great work in preparing the minds of the people for the total rejection of the errors of the Church of Rome." — *Lathbury*, p. 4.

† Between 1525, when Tyndale's New Testament was first printed, and 1535–36, fifteen distinct impressions of this excellent translation found their way covertly into England, and they were not small editions either; and in 1536 alone, there were ten editions. Tyndale first published the gospel of St. Matthew, "printed as it was written by the Evangelist"; then, the gospel of St. Mark, probably at Hamburg, in 1525; though "no fragment of this first fruit of Tyndale's scriptural labors is known to be remaining." Then followed, the same year, "The Newe Testament in Englysshe," with glosses and a prologue — begun at Cologne, by P. Quentel, and finished at Worms, by Peter Schœffer. Only thirty-one leaves of this edition are now to be found. The same year, another edition of the same appeared,

demned though it was by the Church and State authorities; and portions of the Old Testament in English had also been put into circulation;* yet, previous to this time, no complete Bible in English had been printed. But in the autumn or winter of this year came from the press this precious boon to the English nation — the whole Bible in English. It was the work of Myles Coverdale, afterwards, for a little time, bishop of Exeter. He was encouraged probably by the queen, Anne Boleyn, and supported by Lord Cromwell, the vicar-general of the kingdom. Whether this translation was made from the original languages does not clearly appear, though the title-page and the prologue seem to imply that it was derived chiefly from other translations.† It was a small folio, or

without name or place. — *Anderson's Annals of the English Bible*, vol. I. p. 547, and Index to vol. II. pp. 7, 8; *Cotton's Editions of the Bible*, etc., pp. 1, 2.

* Genesis and Deuteronomy in separate books were published in 1530; The Pentateuch, with a general preface, and a second edition of Genesis, in January, 1530-31. — *Anderson*, I. 241, 242, and II. Index, p. 7.

† "To helpe me herin, I have had sondrye translacions, not onely in latyn, but also of the Douche interpreters; whom (because of theyr syngular gyftes and speciall diligence in the Bible) I have ben the more glad to folowe for the most parte, accordynge as I was requyred." — *Prologue.*

Whittaker, however, maintains that "the Hebrew text is by Coverdale most faithfully and ably translated"; and *Dr. Geddes* "scruples not to affirm, that this translation is one of more merit, and is more according to the original (such as Coverdale had it), than the present authorized version." — *Memoir of Coverdale*, p. 78. *Anderson*, on the contrary, insists, that,

what would now be called royal octavo, very handsomely printed, and illustrated with numerous wood engravings of indifferent workmanship. Its title-page, bordered with small engravings, read thus: "Biblia. The Bible, that is, the Holy Scripture of the Olde and New Testament, faithfully and truly translated out of the Douche and Latyn in to Englishe. MDXXXV. S. Paul II. Tessa. III. Praie for vs, that the worde of God maie have fre passage, and be glorified, & ct. S. Paul Col. III. Let the worde of Christ dwell in you plenteously in all wysdome & ct. Josue I. Let not the boke of this lawe departe out of thy mouth, but exercyse thyselfe therein daye and nighte & ct."

On the reverse: "Prynted in the yeare of oure Lorde MD.XXXV., and fynished the fourth daye of October." *

Neither the printer's name nor the place where it was printed is given. It is probable, however,

though Coverdale was competent to translate from the Hebrew, yet his leaning to the Vulgate and German versions is quite apparent, and *expediency* was far too much consulted in the undertaking throughout. — Vol. I. p. 564. And *Cotton* says: "We readily concede to Mr. Anderson, that Coverdale did not translate from the Hebrew and Greek originals, but from the Latin Vulgate, * * * still he has deserved well of every friend to the English Reformation." — *Editions of the Bible and Parts thereof in English*, p. 11, Pref. Oxford, 1852.

* This indicates the time when the translator's work was finished, not when the book came from the press. It probably required several weeks to complete the work, bind up the sheets, and get them to England.

that Frankfort or Zurich was the place, though Cologne has also been suggested. It was dedicated to the king and to "his dearest just wyfe, and most vertuous pryncesse, Quene Anne" — Anne Boleyn. Where the translation was made, or how long Coverdale was employed on it, is not known. It has been conjectured with much probability, that he retired to the privacy of his old convent in Cambridge for this purpose.*

Probably in the winter of 1535–36, a copy of this Bible was presented to Lord Cromwell, to be submitted to the king for his approval and license. The king committed the book to Gardiner and other bishops for examination. But they were in no haste to report. "After they had kept it long in their hands, and the king was divers times sued unto for the publication thereof, at the last being called for by the king himself, they redelivered the book. And being demanded by the king what was their judgment of the translation, they an-

* See his letter to Cromwell, dated "from the Augustyns, this May Day" — convent of the Augustine monks, Cambridge — in which he says: "I humbly desyre and beseeche your goodnesse, of your gracyus helpe. Now I begyne to taste of Holy Schryptures; now (honour be to God) I am sett to the most swete smell of holy lettyres, with the godly savour of holy and awncyent Doctoures, unto whose knowledge I cannot attayne without dyversyte of bookys, as is not unknowne to your most excellent cuystome. Nothyng in the world I desyre but bookys, as concernyng my learnyng," etc. etc. — *Memorials of the Right Reverend Father in God, Myles Coverdale*, etc. Appendix, No. 1. Lond. Samuel Bagster, 1838. See also *Anderson*, I. 558.

swered that there were many faults therein. 'Well,' said the king, 'but are there any heresies maintained thereby?' They answered that there were no heresies that they could find maintained thereby. 'If there be no heresies,' said the king, 'then, in God's name, let it go abroad among the people.'"*

The king is reported to have been influenced to make this decision in favor of Coverdale's translation by the intercessions of the queen; to whom is also attributed the royal injunction mentioned by Fox, as "given about the year of our Lord 1536 and 1537," requiring the clergy to provide "a booke of the whole Bible, bothe in Latine and *also in English*, and lay the same in the quire, for every man that will to look and read thereon," etc.†

But before this injunction could be obeyed, if not before it could be issued, a change came over Henry. Anne Boleyn lost his favor, and soon fell before his wrathful and merciless tyranny; and

* Bishop Fulke's *Defence of the Translation of the Holy Scriptures*, Parker Soc. ed., p. 98; *Mem. Coverdale*, p. 71; *Pettigrew's Bibliotheca Susseriana*, p. 270.

Fulke was a contemporary of Coverdale, and professes to give, in the words quoted in the text, the substance of what he heard Coverdale himself say, in a sermon preached at St. Paul's, in defence of his translation of the Bible. *Anderson* (vol. II. pp. 88, 89) applies this anecdote to a later edition — to Cranmer's Bible of 1539–40, and says: "this anecdote has been very generally misplaced in its application."

† *Fox*, II. 324–25. "Through the intercession of Queen Anne, the king at last granted that the English Bibles might be printed and placed in every church, where the people might read them." —*Ant. Ecc. Brit.*, p. 885, ed. 1572, in *Mem. of Coverdale*, p. 78.

everything on which she had smiled naturally incurred the king's frown.*

Under this change of affairs, it would have been foolhardiness for any one to have attempted to put into circulation a book in which Queen Anne was pronounced the king's "dearest just wife, and most virtuous princess."

A few copies had, however, got abroad with these offensive words in them; others were altered with a pen, so as to read "Quene *JAne*," instead of "Anne." But it was obvious that a new dedication was indispensable, and it was prepared. There was also an attempt to make it appear like a new book, by means of a new title-page.† Yet,

* *Anderson*, I. 563. Anne Boleyn was committed to the Tower on the 2d of May, 1536, and was executed on the 19th of May, same year. Her fall had doubtless begun several months before her arrest and confinement in the Tower.

That the king had given his sanction to the publication of Coverdale's Bible, is fairly inferrible from the language of the preface to the *Institution of a Christian man*, or the King's Book, which bears date July 23d, 1537. In this, the bishops give thanks to God for "such a king to reign over us, which so earnestly mindeth to set forth among us his subjects *the light of Holy Scripture*, which alone showeth the right path to come to God." Certainly this must refer to Coverdale's translation, for no other then existed in print in England. — *Anderson*, I. 575.

† *Annals Eng. Bib.*, I. 562–65. A beautiful copy of this rare and costly book, the only one in New England, and with a single exception the only one in this country, is found in Mr. George Livermore's rich and extensive collection of Bibles.

From Mr. Livermore, who is authority in all such matters, I learn that no *perfect copy* of the original edition of Coverdale's Bible is known to exist, and that the only copy with the original

after all, this Bible seems never to have secured much of the royal favor nor that of the people. Still, its publication was an event worthy of grateful commemoration.*

The parliament which commenced its sessions June 8th, 1536, passed a most important act, in addition to, and in completion of all other acts on the same general subject, entitled: "An Acte Extyngurysshing the Auctoryte of Busshop of Rome." This act, after berating the bishop of Rome for his usurpations and "his worldly and carnal affections, as pomp, glory, avarice, ambition, and tyranny," etc. etc., proceeds to declare, that if any person or persons within the realm shall, by writing, ciphering, printing, preaching, or teaching, deed or act, hold or stand with, to extol, set forth,

title-page is in the library of the Earl of Leicester; and that Lea Wilson, of London, the celebrated bibliographist, was so desirous of completing his copy, that he offered one hundred pounds for a genuine title-page. But not succeeding in obtaining an original, his copy was supplied with a fac-simile. In this condition it was sold, after Mr. Wilson's death, for three hundred and sixty-five pounds. A good copy of this Bible now readily sells for two or three hundred guineas, or from ten to fifteen hundred dollars! Mr. James Lenox, of New York, is the owner of the only copy of this Bible, besides Mr. Livermore's, known to be in this country.

* The new title-page read: "The Byble, that is, the Holye Scrypture of the Olde and New Testamente faythfully translated in Englysh, and newly ouersene and correcte. MDXXXVII." — *Anderson*, II. Index, p. 8.

Anderson puts this under the year 1536, and so does *Cotton* (pp. 10, 11); but if this title is correct, it was published the year following.

maintain, or defend the authority, jurisdiction, or power of the bishop of Rome, all such persons, their aiders, abettors, favorers, etc., shall incur and run into the dangers, penalties, pains, and forfeitures provided and ordained by the statutes of Provisors and Præmunire. Justices of the assize and of the peace are required to inquire into these offences, and justices of the king's bench to proceed as in cases of præmunire.*

In 1536 appeared the king's proclamation against the excessive number of holy-days, particularly in harvest time, "the keeping of which greatly hindered the gathering in of the corn, hay, fruit, and other such necessary commodities." And following this, another royal proclamation against the abuse of images, pilgrimages, belief in relics and blind miracles, etc. etc.

The year 1537 deserves special commemoration in the history of the Reformation, as the year in which appeared the first royal proclamation in favor of the Bible in English. During the previous year an injunction seems to have been drawn up by the vicar-general, Cromwell, to authorize the use of Coverdale's Bible in the churches, as Fox reports.† But, as this article is not found in

* *Statutes*, 28 Hen. VIII. ch. 10.

† *Acts and Mons.*, II. 824, 825: "*Item*. That every parson or proprietary of any parish church within this realm, shall on this side the feast of St. Peters, *ad vincula*, next coming, provide a book of the whole Bible, both in Latin and also in English, and lay the same in the quire, for every man that will to look and read

Cranmer's register, the reasonable presumption is, that the injunction was suppressed, perhaps in consequence of the fall of Anne Boleyn; and that the king, though he once may have given his verbal approval of Coverdale's translation, never formally and publicly recognized the work, nor authorized its introduction into the churches. This year, however, appeared a proclamation by the king's authority, and certain injunctions addressed to the clergy of the realm, permitting and commanding the Bible, being translated into our mother tongue, to be sincerely taught and declared by the clergy, and to be openly laid forth in every parish church, to the intent that all the king's good

thereon; and shall discourage no man from the reading of any part of the Bible, either in Latin or English; but rather comfort, exhort, and admonish every man to read the same, as the very word of God, and the spiritual food of man's soul, whereby they may the better know their duties to God, to their sovereign lord the king, and their neighbor."

Burnet gives this injunction in his copy, but says in a foot-note: "This paragraph is not among the injunctions in the register." — Vol. II. pt. II. bk. III. coll. VII. p. 254. He does not give his authority for inserting it, nor any reason why it is inserted among the injunctions, if not found in the register. The inference is, that he thought it belonged there.

In Fox's copy of the injunctions, of which the above forms one, we read: "In the name of God, Amen. In the year of our Lord God 1536, and of the most noble reign of our sovereign lord Henry Eighth, etc. * * * the 28th." But in his account of these injunctions, *Fox* says: "After these Injunctions and Articles afore expressed (which were given *about the year of our Lord* 1536 and 1537), it was not above the space of a year, but other injunctions also were published," etc. etc. — Vol. II. pp. 323, 325.

subjects, as well by reading thereof as by hearing the true explanation of the same, might first learn their duties to Almighty God, and his majesty, and one another; keeping always in remembrance, that all things contained in this book were the undoubted will, law, and commandment of Almighty God.*

The Injunctions relating to this matter were as follows:—"*Item:* That ye shall provide on this side the feast of N. [Nativity, Dec. 25th] next coming, one book of the whole Bible of the *largest volume* in English, [to distinguish the authorized Bible, or Matthew's, from Coverdale's, which was a smaller volume by some two inches,] and the same set up in some convenient place within the said church that ye have care of, where your parishioners may most commodiously resort to the same and read it; the charges of which book shall be ratably borne between you, the parson, and the parishioners aforesaid; that is to say, the one half by you and the other half by them. *Item:* That ye discourage no man privily or apertly [openly] from the reading or hearing of the same Bible; but shall expressly provoke, stir, and exhort every person to read the same, as that which is the very lively word of God that every Christian man is bound to embrace, believe, and follow, if he look

* I have given only the gist of the proclamation. It may be found entire in *Chester's Life of John Rogers*, Appendix, pp. 433, 434. It is in abbreviated, awkward English, hardly intelligible to an unskilled reader.

to be saved; admonishing them, nevertheless, to avoid all contention and altercation therein, and to use an honest sobriety in the inquisition of the true sense of the same, and to refer the explication of the obscure places to men of higher judgment in Scripture." *

Here is a complete and apparently hearty indorsement and commendation of the Bible in English, which would have made an old Lollard's heart leap for joy. The king of England, by his vicegerent, calling on the clergy of his realm to "provoke, stir, and exhort every person" in the realm to read the Bible in English, "*as that which is the very lively word of God* that every Christian man is bound to embrace, believe, and follow, if he look to be saved"! What more could be asked? It was for this that the king had been petitioned, and the parliament had been moved; it was for this that good men had prayed, and labored, and suffered the loss of all things worldly, yea, had laid down their very lives, yet all in vain! And now, almost without an effort, or simply for the asking, the king grants this greatest of earthly boons to his poor people! Surely, "the king's heart is in the hand of the Lord, as the rivers of water: he turneth it whithersoever he will." †

* *Cranmer's Register*, fol. 99 b., in *Chester's Life of John Rogers*, 41, 42; *Fox*, II. 325; *Anderson*, II. 33, 34.

† *Burnet* says of these injunctions: "These were equally ungrateful to the corrupt clergy and to the laity that adhered to the old doctrine. The very same opinions about pilgrimages, images,

And when we consider whose translation of the Bible the king of England thus sanctions, and commends to all his subjects as "the very lively word of God," our admiration of God's ways with men must be still more enhanced! This Bible, which appeared under the fictitious name of "Thomas Matthew" as the translator, was the work of William Tyndale and John Rogers. From the winter of 1523–24, Tyndale had been almost incessantly employed in translating and printing different portions of the Bible. In the midst of poverty and persecution, an exile from his native land, hiding himself in a foreign country, and driven from one place to another, his labors often interrupted, his printed sheets seized and destroyed, himself watched and hunted by the emissaries of Wolsey and Sir Thomas More, he had nevertheless persevered in his holy work; and before his toilsome and useful life could be brought to a violent end, he had succeeded in perfecting and publishing numerous editions of the New Testament, and had translated the Old Testament in order, as far as the end of the Second of Chronicles, and probably other books partially.* Here his labors closed.

and saints departed, and instructing the people in the principles of Christian religion in the vulgar tongue, for which the Lollards were not long ago either burnt or forced to abjure them, were now set up by the king's authority." — Vol. I. pt. I. bk. III. p. 454.

* *Anderson*, I. 570: "* * * It must be presumed that there were other chapters in manuscript. * * * in whole or in part: Esther viii., Prov. xxxi., Isaiah i. ii. vii. xliv. li. liii. lviii., Jer.

Sometime in 1535 he was arrested, and confined in prison at Vilvorde (or Vilvoorden), in Belgium, and on the 6th of October, 1536, was strangled and burned to ashes, for being the great instrument of introducing into his native land the purest and best translation of the Word of God then, if not now, extant!* But, though the translator of the Scriptures was thus cruelly and prematurely cut off, his manuscripts were saved, and a kindred spirit was provided to take up the unfinished work and carry it on to completion. John Rogers, "the Martyr," had been for some time engaged in this work, and had carried the good book half through the press, when Grafton and Whitchurch, afterwards the celebrated London printers, became aware of the fact and proposed to become the publishers. Grafton put nearly all he was worth (five hundred pounds) into the enterprise; and it was driven on with so much energy that before August 4th, 1537, the completed work was in England — less than a year after the dying martyr had cried, "Lord, open the king of England's eyes!" No time was lost by the enterprising publishers in placing a copy of this new translation in the hands of Archbishop Cranmer; who, after an examination, sufficient to satisfy him of

xxviii., Ezek. i. viii. xxxvi., Joel ii. iii., Hosea xi., Amos iv., and Zech. ii. viii."

* For the particulars of the arrest and execution of Tyndale, see *Anderson*, vol. i. sect. xii. p. 416; *Fox*, ii. 801–8.

the general excellence of the work, sent it to Lord Cromwell, on the 4th of August, 1537, with an earnest recommendation to this effect:—

"My especial good lord, after most hearty commendations unto your lordship. This shall be to signify unto the same, that you shall receive, by the bringer hereof, a Bible in English, both of a new translation and a new print, dedicated unto the king's majesty, as further appeareth by a pistle unto his grace, in the beginning of the book, which, in mine opinion, is very well done, and therefore I pray your lordship to read the same. And as for the translation, so far as I have read thereof, I like it better than any other translation heretofore made; yet not doubting but that there may and will be found some faults therein, as you know no man ever did or can do so well, but it may be, from time to time, amended; and forasmuch as the book is dedicated unto the king's grace, and also great pains and labor taken in setting forth of the same, I pray you, my Lord, that you will exhibit the book unto the king's highness; and to obtain of his grace, if you can, a license that the same may be sold, and read of every person, without danger of any act, proclamation, or ordinance heretofore granted to the contrary, until such time that we, the bishops, shall set forth a better translation, which I think will not be till a day after Domesday. And if you continue to take such pains for the setting forth of God's word, as

you do, although in the mean season you suffer some snubs, many slanders, lies, and reproaches for the same, yet one day He will requite altogether; and the same Word (as St. John saith) 'which shall judge every man at the last day,' must needs show favor to them that now do favor it. Thus, my lord, right heartily fare you well." *

Lord Cromwell seems to have entered heartily into the good archbishop's views; and notwithstanding the failure of what may be regarded as his own special enterprise, the Coverdale Bible, immediately used his great influence with the king to secure the licensure and adoption of this new translation of the Holy Scriptures; and with so good effect, that in a few days the desired license was obtained, to the great joy of Cranmer's heart, as appears from letters addressed to Cromwell, the first dated the 13th of August, and the other the 28th of the same month. In the first he says: "Whereas I understand that your lordship, at my request, hath not only exhibited the Bible which I sent unto you, to the king's majesty, but also hath obtained of his grace that the same shall be allowed by his authority, shall be bought and read within this realm. My lord, for this your pain taken in this behalf I give unto you my most hearty thanks, assuring your lordship for the con-

* *State Papers*, vol. I. pt. II. No. 94, in *Chester's Life of John Rogers*, 425; *Anderson*, I. 379.

tention of my mind, you have showed me more pleasure herein than if you had given me a thousand pounds." And in another letter, written fifteen days after the above, he says, as if his heart was overflowing with joy: "This shall be to give you most hearty thanks that any heart can think, and that in the name of them all which favoreth God's word, for your diligence at this time in procuring the king's highness to set forth the said God's word and his gospel by his grace's authority." *

Thus even the king of England's eyes were opened by the fingers of the Almighty, and the precious Word of God, so long hid from the longing eyes of the people of England, allowed to have free course through the land. And the eager desire of the people to read the Scriptures in their own mother tongue was so great, that, though one or more revised editions of Coverdale's Bible appeared this same year,† yet a second edition of two thousand five hundred copies of the large and expensive volume of Matthew's Bible was called for in 1538, and no less than seven editions, or impressions, of the New Testament, not to speak of a number of issues of portions of God's word with expositions and commentaries. ‡

* *Cotton's Ms., Cleop.* E. V., fols. 300 and 348, in *Chester's Life of Rogers*, 426, 427.

† *Mem. of Coverdale*, 221, 223; *Cotton* gives but *two*, p. 12.

‡ *Cotton*, 14; *Pettigrew*, 270 and on.

I have been thus particular about this Bible, because great con-

The floodgates of Divine truth were now fairly opened; and no power, royal, papal, or diabolical, could ever after fully stop the gracious flood. Strype tells us, that "it was wonderful to see with what joy this book of God was received, not only among the learneder sort, but generally all England over, among all the vulgar and common people; and with what greediness God's word was read, and what resort to places where the reading of it was! Everybody that could, bought the book, or got others to read it to them, if they could not themselves. Divers more elderly people learned to read on purpose; and even little boys flocked,

fusion prevails respecting its history, and many writers have confounded this with other Bibles, and so mingled the story of this with other translations as greatly to confound one seeking accurate information; and surely it is worth while to know exactly the history of the first publicly authorized version of the Bible in English, as well as that of the first printed English Bible. Take Mr. Neal's account as an illustration of confusion and error. *History of the Puritans*, vol. i. p. 69. He says this Bible was first printed at Hamburg, in 1532; which was five years before it appeared, and three years before *any* translation of the entire Bible was printed. And when it did appear, it did not come from Hamburg. He says that Coverdale assisted in translating it; which Anderson shows to have been a mistake. He further says that archbishop Cranmer reviewed and corrected it, and added a preface; whereas it is evident from Cranmer's own letter that he could never have seen it until it was placed in his hands complete and printed. And finally, that it was sometimes called "Cranmer's Bible"; when it is well known that "Cranmer's," or "the Great Bible," did not appear until 1540. The public are greatly indebted to Mr. Anderson for his thorough investigation and elucidation of everything connected with the history of English Bibles.

among the rest, to hear portions of the Holy Scriptures read." *

The injunctions issued in 1536, against the excessive number of holy-days, and the abuse of images, the practice of pilgrimages, and the superstitious belief in relics, etc., were repeated in 1538; and a practical application of them was made, by the utter destruction of some of the richest and most frequented shrines in the kingdom, and the exposure of the tricks and contrivances of the clergy to impose on the people and extort money by means of certain celebrated images, which had inward machinery to move their limbs or eyes. This exposure helped greatly to open the eyes of the people to the corruptions and falsehoods of the Romish system, by which they had been cheated all their lives; and to advance, in a corresponding degree, the great work of reformation.†

* *Strype's Cranmer*, vol. I. ch. XVII. p. 91. Oxford edition, 1840.

† *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. III. pp. 485–; vol. III. pt. I. bk. III. p. 254; and pt. II. No. 55; *Froude*, III. 285–90; *Fox*, II. 330, 431.

Among the impositions practised by the priests, the following are enumerated by Lord Herbert, copied from records of the visitors of the monasteries: — In *eleven* different places was shown the Virgin Mary's girdle; and in *eight* different places her milk was shown. The bell of St. Guthlac, and the felt of St. Thomas, of Lancaster, were exhibited as remedies for headache. The penknife, the boots, and a piece of the shirt of St. Thomas, of Canterbury, were much reverenced. The coals that roasted St. Lawrence were shown; two heads of St. Ursula; the paring of St. Edmund's nails; the image of an angel with one wing, that brought to England the spear's head that pierced Christ's side;

Another of the significant public acts of the times was the supposititious trial and condemna-

an image of Our Lady, with a taper in her hand, which burnt nine years together without wasting, till one, forswearing himself thereon, it went out, and was found to be but a piece of wood; the Rood of Grace, at Boxley, in Kent. This had cunningly contrived machinery, by means of which the image was made to move its eyes and lips. At Hales, in Gloucestershire, was shown the blood of Jesus, brought from Jerusalem, and kept for ages. This had drawn many offerings, even from remote places. On examination, it was found to be duck's blood, which was renewed every week. The blood was placed in a glass, one side of which was so thick that the blood could not be seen through it, while the other side was thin. If a visitor did not offer liberally, the thick side was presented; an increase of the offering brought round the thin side, and lo, the blood was visible! — *Herbert's Life of Henry VIII.*, p. 495. *Fox* tells us of the images of Walsingham, Ipswich, Worcester, the Lady of Willesdon, Thos. Becket, with many more, "having engines, to make their eyes open and roll about, and other parts of their body to stir; and many other false jugglings * * * all which were espied out and destroyed." — Vol. II. p. 330. Dr. London, one of the visitors of the monasteries, reported among other things, that he found as many pieces of the cross of the Saviour as would make a large, whole cross; also, relics against rain, and for hindering weeds from springing, etc. — *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. III. p. 485.

As an illustration of the superstitious use made of the shrines and images in different parts of the kingdom, take the following account by Price, one of the visitors, of a huge wooden image which he found in Wales, called Darvel Gatheren. He says, "that the people of the country had a great superstition for it; so that the day before he wrote (April 5th, 1537) there were reckoned to be above five or six hundred pilgrims there. Some brought oxen and cattle, and some brought money; and it was generally believed that if any offered to that image, he had power to deliver his soul from hell." The image was brought to London, "where it served for fuel to burn friar Forrest." — *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk.

tion, in 1538, for rebellion, contumacy, and treason, of the world-renowned "Saint Thomas à Becket," archbishop of Canterbury, who had been in his grave between three and four hundred years. For these alleged crimes the bones of the old sinner were ordered to be dug up, his shrine at Canterbury demolished, its offerings forfeited to the crown, his day stricken from the calendar, and "the office" for his festivity dashed from the breviaries.

The significancy of these acts appears from the consideration that the Romish church had contrived to make Thomas à Becket — in whose person, or rather in whose death, the papal power had triumphed over the royal power in England — the most popular modern saint in all the calendar. His shrine was more visited than any other in the kingdom, and the offerings made to it were more numerous and richer. Pilgrims came to it from all parts of Christendom, bringing gifts and worship. Even princes and crowned heads thus honored the memory of Becket. One of the richest jewels in Europe was presented to this shrine, by Louis VII., of France. The very pavement

m. p. 487. Dr. Forrest belonged to the convent of "Observant Friars," at Greenwich, and was confessor to Queen Catharine, and suffered in 1538 as a traitor and heretic, being suspended by chains round his waist and under his arms, and thus hung, while he was consumed by a slow fire; very much as was the brave old Lollard, Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, a century and a quarter before him.

around the shrine was worn away by the kneeling myriads of worshippers. There were two holy-days, yearly, devoted to this papal martyr; and every fiftieth year there was a jubilee for fifteen days, during which indulgence was granted to all who visited the shrine of the martyr. About one hundred thousand persons are said to have paid their homage at this shrine during the fifteen days devoted to the sixth jubilee of Becket's translation, in 1420. Thus the Romish church was able to make Becket's bones a constant proclamation to Christendom of the superiority of papal over kingly power; while, at the same time, she gathered enormous wealth from her impositions. The ever flowing stream of pilgrims to this altar, and the offerings laid thereon, were naturally enough regarded by Henry and his counsellors as so many intolerable protests against the royal supremacy. His saintship was therefore denounced as a traitor and rebel against his sovereign, and was summoned into court to answer to these charges. The dry bones, not obeying the summons, were pronounced contumacious, were dug up, and either burned or mixed with other bones; and, what was hardly less important in Henry's eyes, two chests full of gold, so heavy "that they were a load to eight strong men to carry them out of the church," were emptied into the royal treasury.*

* *Herbert*, p. 501; *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. III. pp. 488–96; *Lingard*, vol. VI. ch. IV. p. 275; *Fox*, II. 869.

In 1539, Hilsey, bishop of Rochester, published a primer somewhat resembling Marshall's, though perhaps rather more like the Sarum Primer, or the King's Primer. This primer was submitted to Cranmer, and corrections were made by him, but they were not admitted by Hilsey; and "in many particulars, and especially in those connected with the peculiarities of Romanism, the book differed from the primer by Marshall. It rather receded on these points." * But, like its predecessor, it contained various portions of Scripture, and was of considerable value in familiarizing the common people, among whom it was particularly designed to circulate, with the Word of God, and in preparing them to read that sacred book.

The "Matthew Bible," (Tyndale's,) we are told by Fox, did not a little offend the clergy, namely, the bishop of Winchester and his fellows; particularly on account of its prologues and its special table of texts about the Lord's supper, marriage of priests, and the mass; and Henry was importuned for a new version, without any prologues or annotations, which they said were made vehicles of heretical and defamatory matter. So the king committed the matter to Cromwell; and he authorized Grafton and Whitchurch, the London printers, to bring out an edition of the Bible which, for correctness and elegance, should surpass any which had yet appeared. They employed Coverdale to

* *Lathbury*, 5–7.

superintend the printing, and chose Paris as the place to print it in, on account of the superiority of the workmen in that city, and the excellence of the paper to be had there. The work was immediately commenced; but, before it could be completed, the Inquisition interfered, arrested the printer, and seized the printed sheets and ordered them to be burned. Fortunately, however, Grafton and Coverdale, having some premonition of the approaching catastrophe, had previously sent off to England so much of the Bible as was finished; and of the condemned sheets, "four great dry fats of them," which had been sold to a haberdasher for waste paper, instead of being burned, were recovered by purchase, so that, probably, but a small portion of the entire edition of two thousand five hundred copies was lost to the publishers.* The Englishmen escaped unharmed; and after a while returned to Paris, secured the presses and types, and even the workmen, removed them all to London, and there finished the undertaking, and brought out the Bible in April, 1539.† This was called the "Great Bible," and sometimes "Cranmer's Bible," though the edition of 1540, which has a prologue by Cranmer, is more prop-

* *Anderson*, II. 28–30.

† The order from the Inquisition for the seizure of the sheets was dated Dec. 17th, 1538. The work must then have been very nearly finished, and very few sheets could have been lost, or it would not have been completed at this date.

erly "Cranmer's Bible." It for a while was the standard version, for use in the churches.

In 1539, another work of great historical interest and value appeared from the press, under the favor of Cromwell. It was "Taverner's Bible," with introductory matter, notes, tables, etc.; and was specially adapted to private use. Two, if not three, editions appeared in the course of the year.* What renders this Bible specially deserving of notice is the introductory and explanatory matter which accompanies the text, in which some of the leading tenets of popery are distinctly and pointedly repudiated. For example, in speaking of the priesthood, Taverner says: "The order of priesthood is translated; that is to say, abolished, ceased, and finished, in such wise as there must now be no more; for we are all priests to God, that we should offer ourselves a spiritual sacrifice, even as Christ offered himself," etc. Of the *mass* he says: "This word is not in the Bible, therefore he could do no better but to send the reader to the supper of our Lord Jesus Christ." So he speaks of *purgatory* as a word not to be found in the Bible; and tells his readers that there is no other means provided for the purging away of their sins but the passion of Christ. Under the head of *sacrifice*, he says: "The bread and wine received in the supper of Christ are no sacrifice, (for Christ was offered once sufficiently for our

* *Cotton*, 15, 16; *Anderson*, II. 80–82.

sins, Heb. x.) but a holy memory of the death of Christ." "The *supper* of our Lord," he says, "is a holy memory and giving thanks for the death of Christ." He speaks of "ministers *or* bishops." He asserts that "a man ought to make no images, for God hateth them; and whosoever maketh them is cursed of him"; and that "the Lord hateth the *holy-days*." Of the *sacraments* he says: "Christ hath left us two signs, for to show and protest our faith before his church; that is to say, the water of baptism, and the bread and wine of his holy supper." "The *keys*," he tells us, "are the law and word of God, by the which we do shut and open the kingdom of heaven; that is to say, the church. Christ only giveth the keys to bind and loose by his word. Whosoever is filled with the Holy Ghost, hath power to show by the Word of God, that they which do believe (that remission of sins is done by Christ) are absolved (which is to open); and that they which do not believe it, are bound (which is to shut), Jno. xx." "*Excommunication* and rejection from the holy assembly of our Lord Jesus Christ," he informs us, "is done by the church against open and obstinate sinners, Matt. xviii." Among his definitions of *a church* are the following: "The faithful gathered together in one house are a church." Rom. xvi., Col. iv. "A *bishop*," according to Taverner, "is an overseer, a watcher ever any manner of thing whatsoever it be." *

* I quote from the edition of 1549, in two small quarto vol-

Thus we see, in 1539, the priesthood denied by royal authority; masses and purgatory ignored; the sacraments described as nothing but outward signs; and the eucharist treated as simply a memorial supper, without sacrificial character: all which, it need hardly be added, was rank Lollardy, which in previous years had sent hundreds of poor saints to the prisons of the bishops, and many to the martyr's stake.

The years 1540 and 1541, though barren of religious interest otherwise,* may be fitly called the Bible Era of the English Reformation; for, during these two years, not less than seven distinct editions of the Bible were printed in London. Six of these were handsome folios; and the editions consisted of from fifteen hundred to two thousand five hundred copies each. Besides these, there were printed

umes, black letter, kindly loaned me by Mr. George Livermore, of Cambridge. The first editions, of 1539, one in folio and the other in quarto, I have not been able to find. The "Postils on the Epistles and Gospels, compiled and published by Richard Taverner, in the year 1540," were republished at Oxford, in 1840, in one volume, 8vo. pp. 612. Taverner was one of Wolsey's scholars, who was arrested while at Oxford University, for reading and having in his possession Tyndale's version of the Scriptures, and imprisoned with Clark and others. He escaped condign punishment by Wolsey's interposition, he saying of him: "He is only a musician!" He was the organist of his college, and skilled in music. No less than three editions of Taverner's Bible appeared during the year 1539; and two editions of the New Testament by Taverner, and two by Coverdale. *Cotton*, pp. 15, 16.

* After 1540, *Fox* says, "religion began to go backward." — Vol. II. p. 870.

three editions of the New Testament; four editions of the Epistles and Gospels — two of them with postils "by divers learned men, recognized and augmented by Richard Taverner"; the Epistle to the Ephesians, with a commentary; and two editions of portions of the Old Testament.*

Of the Bibles, the first was finished in April, 1540. It was called the "Great Bible," or "Cranmer's Bible," the archbishop having furnished it with a prologue, and was printed by Edward Whitchurch.† This was regarded during Henry's reign as the standard edition, to be read in the churches; for the king not only commanded that "it be set up in all the churches," and that his order to this effect be read by all the clergy to their people, but also that the order be "set up upon every church door, that it may more largely appear to our subjects." ‡

The same month another, and a different folio edition of the Bible was published by Petyt and Redman. This is styled by Cotton, "Cranmer's Bible"; but Anderson says, "it is not only without Cranmer's prologue, and differs from his translation in the psalms and elsewhere, but the New Testament is said to be after the last recognition of Erasmus * * * It is on a smaller type and pa-

* *Cotton*, 16–18; *Anderson*, II. 127–34, and Index.

† Some copies have Richard Grafton's, and others have Edward Whitchurch's imprint. — *Cotton*, 16. *Anderson*, II. 130, says, "Edward Whytchurche."

‡ *Anderson*, II. 130; *Cotton*, *ut sup.*

per than the last, and seems to have been intended for the use of families." Though neither submitted to any bishop's inspection nor the king's approval, it was warranted by Cromwell, the great patron of the Scriptures, without whose authority no Bible could be published in England.

By July, another edition of the "Great Bible" was called for and published; and in November of the same year, still another edition, which bishops Tunstall and Heath were compelled by the king's command — Cromwell having now fallen — to oversee and approve, though, doubtless, greatly to their annoyance. This, though finished in 1540, was not published until 1541. "In addition to these four [folio] Bibles, it is said that there was a fifth, and in five volumes, as small as sexto-decimo [16mo.], printed by Redman."* In 1541, there was another edition of Tunstall and Heath's overseeing published, and two of Cranmer's Bible. All these Bibles were printed in London; and most of them by means of those very types, presses, and workmen, which were brought from Paris in 1539, when the Inquisition interrupted the printing of the Holy Scriptures in that city, as before related.† Thus did God make the wrath of man to praise him. Thus were some twelve thousand copies of these large and handsome Bibles published in England in the course of two years! which, without these

* *Cotton*, 17; *Anderson*, II. 131–84, and Index.

† *Anderson*, II. 129. See *ante*, p. 118.

foreign types, presses, and workmen, could not have been done.

The sale, as well as the publication of these Bibles, was regulated by government. By the minutes of the privy council, held at Greenwich, April 25th, 1541, we learn, that "it was agreed, that Anthony Marler, of London, merchant, might sell the Bibles of the Great Bible, unbound, for xs. sterling [equal to £7 10s. of the present currency], and bound, being trimmed with bullyons, for xiis. sterling, or equal to £9,"* or to nearly forty-four dollars.

Anthony Marler, of London, here first distinctly brought before us in connection with this important work of publishing English Bibles, was neither a printer nor a bookseller by profession, but a member of the honorable company of haberdashers.† Yet he must have been a princely man; for on him, not on the king, nor the archbishop, nor any of the nobility of the realm, but on plain "Anthony Marler, haberdasher," as he signs himself, devolved the entire expense and risk of the numerous and costly folio Bibles which were published in London during these two eventful years of the Reformation. And this expense, judging from the regulated prices of the books, and from what Grafton invested in the edition of 1537, could

* *Anderson*, II. 142.

† "Haberdasher. One who deals in miscellaneous goods, or small wares, as ribbons, tape, pins, needles, thread, twist, buttons, trimmings, etc." — *Worcester's Dictionary*.

not have been less than *four* or *five thousand pounds sterling*; which, for those times, was a very large sum of money; equal to at least five times that amount now, or to twenty or twenty-five thousand pounds sterling, or nearly five times as many thousand dollars! Thus did God raise up men and means to do his own blessed work!

During the six years between 1535, when the first Bible in English was printed, and the end of 1541, not less than fifteen distinct editions of the entire Bible, in English, twenty editions of the New Testament, and sixteen or eighteen editions of parts of the Old and New Testaments — many of them with postils or commentaries attached — were issued from the press. And, if these editions averaged, as they undoubtedly did, two thousand impressions each, there were scattered over England, or laid up in store for future use, in the course of these memorable years during which the Word of God was permitted to have "free course," not less than thirty thousand Bibles, forty thousand New Testaments, and between thirty and forty thousand copies of parts of the Bible! A glorious seed-sowing for future ages!*

The brief review which has now been taken of the more important acts and transactions which

* *Cotton's* list gives *eighteen* editions of the entire English Bible, and *twenty-two* editions of the New Testament. — Pp. 8–18. *Anderson's* list contains *twenty-six* editions of the New Testament, and *fifteen* editions of the whole Bible. — Vol. II. Index, viii.–x.

mark the progress of the English Reformation, from about the year 1527 to the end of 1541, will help the reader to trace the gradual development of the principles embodied and confessed by the Congregationalists of a subsequent period.

CHAPTER IV.

OBSTACLES TO THE ENGLISH REFORMATION. — THE CHANGEABLE COURSE OF THE KING. — TRACT AND BOOK DISTRIBUTORS.

It must not be supposed that the work of turning the pope out of England — the "strong man armed" out of his palace — was accomplished without hard fighting. If "Michael and his angels fought against the dragon, the dragon fought and his angels," too.* The pope did not yield his sovereignty in England without a death-struggle. He unscrupulously availed himself of traitors with-

* *Bishop Burnet*, in his Introduction to the history of the Reformation in 1535, says: — "The king having passed through the traverses and tossings of his suit of divorce, and having, with the concurrence both of his clergy and parliament, brought about what he had projected, seemed now at ease in his own dominions. But though matters were carried in public assemblies smoothly and successfully, yet there were many secret discontents, which being fomented both by the pope and the emperor's agents, wrought him great trouble, so that the rest of his life was full of vexation and disquiet." And he further tells us, that "all who were zealously addicted to what they called the old religion, were everywhere meeting together, and consulting what should be done for suppressing heresy and preserving the catholic faith." — Vol. I. pt. I. bk. III. p. 361.

in and enemies without. He stirred up the Romish nobility of the kingdom, to rebel against their sovereign; and he summoned the kings of the earth to make war on the heretical English. Most of the dignified clergy of the land, too, were the pope's friends, and did their utmost to prevent the work of reform, or to overturn it after it had been effected; while many of the inferior clergy, and especially the monks and friars, were ever ready to excite the people against the Reformation, at the bidding of their superiors, because it threatened the extinction of the despotic and profitable power of the priesthood over the poor, ignorant devotees of popery. Against all these coöperating enemies the reformers were compelled to fight their upward way. And, though we may be constrained to condemn the despotic character of the great ruler who sat at the helm of state during those terrible days of storm and tempest, yet may we well doubt whether any sovereign less absolute, unyielding, fearless, and energetic than Henry VIII., could have safely weathered the storm.

Let us look for a moment at some of the items in this general account of obstacles over which the English Reformation triumphed.

One of the early hostile movements against the Reformation was the plot of certain priests and monks, with the cognizance, if not the coöperation of several high dignitaries in Church and State, to frighten the king out of his scheme for divorcing Catharine. The instrument employed was a poor

servant-girl, in Kent, named Elizabeth Barton, afterwards known as "the Maid of Kent," or "the Nun of Kent." After a violent nervous sickness, this young woman fell into a sort of delirium, in which she uttered what the priests were pleased to call prophecies and revelations. These exciting a good deal of interest in the neighborhood, she was taught to continue them, from time to time, and was furnished with suitable revelations and communications for the purpose. The government suffered the plot to go on until the cheats had grown to be rebels; when the Maid and some half a dozen of her chief accomplices were seized, tried, and executed, for a conspiracy against the king's life and crown.

It may seem, at first, a light affair — this attempt of knavish priests to use a simple girl as a prophet; but it will appear otherwise when we consider that among the prophecies put into her mouth were such as these: "that, if the king went on in the divorce and married another wife, he should not be king a month longer, * * * but should die a villain's death"; and when we know that thousands of people were gathered around her to hear these prophecies; that books were written of her revelations; that even bishops, who were known to be devoted to Catharine and the old religion, were on familiar terms with this half-crazy girl; and that the number of influential persons interested in the movement was constantly increasing. When all these things are considered, it need not be counted

strange or unpardonable that the government should interfere, and bring the chief conspirators to an untimely end.*

The mendicant monks were busy during the summer of 1534, travelling up and down the country, in the pope's service; and the religious orders generally were ready to coöperate in any promising scheme of resistance or rebellion. But perhaps the most serious obstruction to the good work was found in the opposition of two distinguished men, Fisher, bishop of Rochester, one of the oldest and most influential prelates, and Sir Thomas More, one of the most learned men and most distinguished statesmen of the kingdom. They both openly and perseveringly refused the oath of succession and supremacy, and for this refusal were finally adjudged guilty of treason, and were executed; as were also several others, monks and friars.† These severe acts produced great excitement throughout Christendom, and particularly in the Roman court, and called forth the famous bull of Paul III., (for Clement was now dead,) interdicting the kingdom and deposing Henry. This bull, though known, was not openly promulgated for some three years afterwards, being kept back chiefly through the influence of Francis I., king of France, as has already been mentioned.

In the spring of 1534, soon after the decision

* *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. II. pp. 302–10; and pt. II. p. 434; *Froude*, vol. II. ch. VII. pp. 164–82, 198–205.

† *Froude*, II. 366–95.

of the Romish court against Henry, which was greeted at Rome with the firing of cannon, the blaze of bonfires, processions, shouts in the streets, and other demonstrations of extravagant joy — soon after this, was brought to England the rumor of gathering hosts on the continent, under the direction of Charles V., to avenge the wrongs of the papacy and the insult to his aunt, Catharine, by the conquest of England. And almost simultaneously with this rumor, Ireland, under the sanction of the pope and the direction of Charles V., broke out into open rebellion, the progress of which was marked by scenes of pillage and massacre, and cold-blooded murders, such as were wont to characterize Irish movements of this kind. An English archbishop, Allen, his chaplains and servants, were among the earliest victims of this rebellion.

The fall of Anne Boleyn, on the 19th of May, 1536, was another severe stroke to the Reformation; for, whether innocent or guilty, Anne had been a steady friend to the reformers and their good work, from her first accession to royal honors to the end of her brief, but brilliant career. Burnet attributes to her influence the order from the king, in 1536, for the immediate preparation and publication of the Bible in the English tongue; which the bishops had been promising for several years, but had not furnished. They had condemned Wickliffe's Bible, as an incorrect translation, and had obtained its prohibition; they had treated

Tyndale's translation in like manner; all the time craftily admitting the value of the book, but declaiming against erroneous translations. They talked about making a true and reliable translation of the Bible, but they were never quite ready to begin, much less to finish such a work; and the English nation might not have had this rich boon when they did, had not Anne Boleyn employed her great influence with the king to induce him to order the work done immediately. This was the last public act of this unfortunate queen, "who," as Burnet says, "the nearer she drew to her end, grew more full of good works." *

The king found immediate consolation for the loss of his once greatly beloved Anne Boleyn, by marrying, on the very day after her execution, Jane Seymour, the most amiable, and probably the best loved of all his wives, and with whose charms he had been smitten some time previous to the discovered or invented criminality of Queen Anne.

In the autumn of 1536 came the great northern rebellion, and the "Pilgrimage of Grace," the most formidable insurrection which Henry ever encountered. It was stirred up and directed by the pope's emissaries.†

In 1538–39 the whole country was again thrown into a state of excitement by the threatened inva-

* *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. III. pp. 391–94.

† *Froude* gives a full and graphic account of the insurrectionary movements in 1536–37. — *Hist. Eng.*, vol. III. ch. XIII.

sion of the emperor Charles V., commissioned by the pope to dethrone the king of England, and punish the nation for its heresy.*

In 1538, Gardiner, the craftiest of the conforming popish bishops, got the ear of Henry, and persuaded him to burn to death that learned, devout, and faithful Lollard, Lambert, or Nicholson, the personal friend of Bilney, and Tyndale, and Frith, who had gone before him in the martyrs' chariot to heaven.† Lambert being dead, Burnet tells us: "the party opposed to the Reformation, headed by Gardiner, persuaded the king that he had got so much reputation to himself by it, that it would effectually refute all aspersions which had been cast on him, as if he intended to change the faith." Neither did they neglect to flatter him as indeed "a defender of the faith, and the supreme head of the church"; and thus to incite him to further acts of severity against the protestants. The bitter fruits of these flatteries appeared in the injunctions set forth by authority of the king against English books, sects, sacramentaries, etc. By these injunctions, an English book imported, sold, or published,

* *Froude*, III. 342–58.

† *Froude*, III. 337–42. *Fox* (II. 331–65) tells the story of Lambert with great particularity, and describes the cruel and unrighteous mock trial which he underwent, in which he was browbeaten and badgered by the king most unmercifully. Lambert's death, though triumphant, was protracted and terrible. He continued to shout, as long as life remained: "None but Christ! None but Christ!" See also *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. III. pp. 505–9.

without license, exposed the offender to loss of goods, fine, and imprisonment during the king's pleasure; and all disputing or arguing about the sacrament of the altar, except by the learned in their schools of divinity and other appointed places, exposed the disputants, not only to fine and imprisonment and confiscation of property, but to loss of life even.*

Early in 1540 was passed a bill entitled "An Act abolishing Diversity in Opinions"; which is better known as the "Six Articles Act," or "the Bloody Statute." This, so far as its influence went, tended to reinstate the doctrines of popery in the church of England. These articles maintained: 1. That in the sacrament of the altar, after the consecrating words of the priest, the natural body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ were present under the form of bread and wine. — 2. That communion in both kinds is not necessary. — 3. That priests may not marry. — 4. That vows of

* "As the Lord of his goodness had raised up Thomas Cromwell to be a friend and patron to the gospel; so, on the contrary side, Satan (which is adversary and enemy to all good things) had his organ also, which was Stephen Gardiner, by all wiles and subtle means to impeach and put back the same. Who, after he had brought his purpose to pass in burning good John Lambert (as ye have heard), proceeding still in his crafts and wiles, and thinking under the name of heresies, sects, anabaptists, and sacramentaries, to exterminate all good books and faithful professors of God's word out of England, so wrought with the king that the next year following, which was of our Lord 1539, he gave out these injunctions." — *Fox*, II. 869.

chastity and widowhood are binding. — 5. That it is meet and necessary that private masses be maintained. — 6. That auricular confession is expedient and necessary. Any person who, by word, writing, etc., should impugn the truth of the first of these articles, was doomed to death by burning, and to a forfeiture of lands and goods. Any person who should preach, teach, or affirm contrary to the other five articles, and any priest or person, having vowed chastity, who should marry, was declared to be a felon, without benefit of clergy. And, not contented with this enactment, the parliament of 1540 confirmed and strengthened the statute by two additional acts; one of which gave the decisions of the clergy in matters of religion, confirmed by the king, the validity and authority of an act of parliament.*

"The Bloody Statute" kindled at once the spirit of persecution; or rather, gave vent to that spirit, which the popish clergy had for a season, though with difficulty, been compelled to restrain. Complaints, and arrests, and imprisonments were heard of on every side. In two weeks' time, *five hundred* persons in London alone were under indictment for violating the six articles; and Fox tells us that the persecution was not confined to London, but extended "to Salisbury, Norfolk, Lincoln, and all other shires and quarters of the realm"; and that

* *Statutes*, 31 Henry VIII. ch. 14, and 32 Henry VIII. chaps. 15, 26.

"such a number out of all parishes in London, and out of Calais, and divers other quarters, were then apprehended through the said Inquisition, that all prisons in London were too little to hold them; insomuch that they were fain to lay them in the halls. At the last, by the means of the good Lord Audley, such pardon was obtained of the king that they were all discharged, being bound only to appear in the star chamber the next day after All-Souls, there to answer, if they were called; but neither was any person called, neither did any appear." *

Shaxton, bishop of Salisbury, and Latimer, bishop of Worcester, both resigned their bishoprics within a week after the adjournment of parliament, and were subsequently imprisoned for speaking against the Six Articles. They lay in prison several years. Cranmer was as much opposed to these articles as either Shaxton or Latimer; but was protected by Cromwell and the king

* *Acts and Mons.*, II. 447–52, where may be found a long list of sufferers under these Six Articles. *Fox* raves against these articles, which he calls "the whip with six strings," denouncing them as "erroneous, pernicious, repugnant and contrarious to the true doctrine, Christian religion, and the word of God, to nature also itself, all reason and honesty"; and he says, in view of the unreasonable and extreme penalty attached to a breach of them, "that a man may deem these laws to be written, not with the ink of Stephen Gardiner, but with the blood of a dragon, or rather the claws of the devil." — *Acts and Mons.*, II. 418. He devotes nearly fifty folio pages to a consideration of these articles. — Vol. II. pp. 370–419.

from the popish commissioners who were appointed to see to the enforcement of the statute.*

In July, 1540, fell — "under the weight of popular odium rather than guilt" — that great man, sagacious statesman, and hearty reformer, Thomas Cromwell.† His fall left Cranmer almost alone

* *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. III. pp. 514–34. *Burnet* says, that "there were also commissions issued out for proceeding upon that statute; and those who were commissioned for London were all secret favorers of popery; so they proceeded most severely, and examined many witnesses against all who were presented; whom they interrogated, not only upon the express words of the statute, but upon all such collateral or presumptive circumstances as might entangle them or conclude them guilty. So that, in a very little while, five hundred persons were put in prison and involved in the breach of the statute. Upon this, not only Cranmer and Cromwell, but the Duke of Suffolk, and Audley the chancellor, represented to the king how hard it would be, and of what ill consequence, to execute the law upon so many persons. So the king was prevailed with to pardon them all; and I find no further proceeding upon this statute till Cromwell fell." — *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. III. p. 534.

† *Statutes*, 31 Henry VIII. ch. 14; *Froude*, III. 303; *Hall's Chronicle*, p. 828; *Fox*, II. 447–52. There were eight charges in the bill of attainder against Cromwell, *four* of which related to his *heretical* character. This fact reveals the true ground of the enmity against him. He had risen, by the force of his genius and capacity for business, from a very humble origin to be the most powerful and influential subject in the kingdom. For this, he was hated by the old nobility. But Cromwell's hatred of popery was undoubtedly his great offence. A forged confession and recantation was published after his death, as was done in the case of that gallant old Lollard, Lord Cobham, who was hanged and burned for his protestantism a century and a quarter before Cromwell's death. The dying prayer of the great statesman and leader of the Reformation contradicts the calumny that he recanted his faith in his last hours: "Lord Jesu! Merciful Lord Jesu Christ!

among the king's counsellors, to support the Reformation; and he was in constant danger. The crafty Gardiner was constantly on the alert to overthrow the great bulwark of the Reformation. Repeatedly were snares laid and plots contrived for the ruin of the good archbishop; and nothing but the inextinguishable confidence of the king in the sterling integrity of Cranmer, or the danger and difficulty of supplying his place, should he be removed, saved him from the block or the stake.*

The happiness of Henry, with his young and amiable wife, Jane Seymour, was of short continuance. Soon after the birth of Edward VI. she

I see and acknowledge that there is in myself no hope of salvation; but all my confidence, hope, and trust is in thy most merciful goodness." Such was Cromwell's dying supplication and confession. See the whole prayer, and an interesting account of this great statesman, in *Froude's Hist. Eng.*, III. 483–526; also *Fox's Acts and Mons.*, II. 419–34. See also *Warner's Ecc. Hist.*, vol. II. p. 197.

* *Anderson* (*Annals of the English Bible*, II. 67) suggests — and it is a suggestion of great force — that friendship for Cranmer had less weight in the king's mind than regard for his own interest. He says: "Henry made but *one* Archbishop of Canterbury, and in a very strange way; but he could not have made a *second* without the greatest personal hazard. Had Cranmer been removed, Tunstall and Gardiner stood in the way, and could not have safely been passed over; but though Henry had been listening to their insidious advice, he had no confidence in either. Besides, bulls could not now have been obtained from Rome; and though the king certainly had gone a great way as head of the English church, an archbishop of his making, without them, would even yet have stood but a poor chance of acceptance with the priests. In the king, therefore, it was nothing but policy to uphold his primate."

died suddenly, on the 24th of October, 1537, sixteen months and four days after her marriage. After much negotiation and indecision, a German princess, Anne of Cleves, was chosen to occupy the vacant place at Henry's side, January 6th, 1540-41. This marriage was promoted by the friends of the Reformation, with the hope of bringing about a closer union between England and the protestant German princes. But Henry, almost from the first sight of his bride, conceived such a loathing of the poor woman, that nothing could reconcile him to a continuance of the marriage relation; and he soon rid himself of the incumbrance, being divorced from Anne on the 28th of July following; and, eleven days afterwards, on the 8th of August, 1541, married Catharine Howard.*

The disgust of Henry towards his German wife, and his marriage with Catharine Howard, gave the popish party new life and hopes. These hopes, however, were speedily dashed by the subsequent discovery of the wanton character of the new queen, and her execution on the 12th of February, 1541-42.

The last wife of Henry, married July, 1543, was Catharine Parr, the widow of Lord Latimer. She was regarded as a friend of the Reformation, and

* *Fox* attributes the passage of the Six Articles bill to "crafty Winchester," Bishop Gardiner. He calls him "the chief captain" among "the pestilent adversaries" of the Reformation; and ascribes to his influence much of Henry's prejudice against Anne of Cleves. — *Acts and Mons.*, II. 876.

narrowly escaped losing her head by reason thereof;* but her influence over the old, diseased, peevish, and passionate king, was comparatively slight. It was rather soothing than controlling: that of a valued nurse, rather than of a loved mistress.

* *Fox*, II. 492; *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. III. pp. 652, 688– *Fox*, in speaking of the period about 1539–40, says: "To many which be yet alive and can testify these things, it is not unknown, how variable the state of religion stood in these days; how hardly, and with what difficulty, it came forth, what chances and changes it suffered. Even as the king was ruled and gave ear, sometime to one, sometime to another, at one while it went forward, at another season as much backward again, and sometime clean altered and changed for a season, according as they could prevail which were about the king." — *Acts and Mons.*, II. 870.

Lord Herbert says of 1541: "And now a cruel time did pass in England; for, as few durst protect those who refused to subscribe to the Six Articles, so they suffered daily, whereof Fox hath many examples; neither was it easy for any man to escape (commissioners being appointed in every shire to search out and examine those who were refractory); nevertheless, their punishment did but advance their religion; for, as they were notified abroad, and together their constancy presented, who were burnt, it was thought they had some assistance from above, it being impossible otherwise that they should so rejoice in the midst of their torments, and triumph over the most cruel death. Therefore, not only the over-learned and better-affected sort, but even all Christian princes, endeavored some consent of opinion; the pope himself not omitting to concur therein, as thinking it better to allow some degrees of latitude, in religion, only when their several authorities might be concerned, than to hazard a general schism and distinction. Hereunto, also, it conduced not a little, that the Turk, taking notice of these divisions, prepared to invade Germany. Therefore, the emperor appointed a meeting at Worms, where divers learned and able men on both sides should dispute, hoping so an end would follow." — *Life of Henry VIII.*, p. 580.

After the death of Cromwell, the Reformation made little or no progress; indeed, the king's course was, on the whole, retrograde, though with occasional turnings towards the right.* The parliament which began its sessions January 22d, 1542-43, passed a severe act, entitled "An Act for the Advancement of true Religion, and for the Abolishment of the contrary." This confirms the act of the Six Articles, condemns what it calls "the crafty, false, and untrue translation of the Old and New Testament in English, of Tyndale, and all other books and writings in the English tongue, teaching contrary to the doctrines set forth by the king since 1540." It forbids the publication of all such books, and "the playing, singing, or rhyming any matter contrary to such doctrines," under the penalty of forfeiture of goods, and perpetual imprisonment for the second offence. It forbids all persons, not specially appointed by lawful authority, to read or expound the Scriptures in any church or open assembly; noblemen and gentlemen only are allowed to read, or cause to be read, the Scriptures in their families, to their servants and others, "quietly and without disturbance of good order"; it provides that "no women, nor ar-

* *Fox* says, that, after the death of Catharine Howard, "the king, calling to remembrance the words of the Lord Cromwell, and missing now more and more his old counsellor, and partly, also, smelling somewhat the ways of Winchester, began a little to set his foot again in the cause of religion." — *Acts and Mons.*, II. 456.

tificers, apprentices, journeymen, serving-men of the degrees of yeomen or under, husbandmen, nor laborers, shall read within this realm or in any other the king's dominions, the Bible or New Testament, in English, to himself or any other, privately or openly, upon pain of one month's imprisonment for every time so offending." A clergyman preaching contrary to the king's doctrine, on refusing to recant and abjure, or on a third offence, shall be deemed a heretic, and be burned, and lose all his goods. Laymen, for the same offence, are doomed, on refusing to abjure, or on a third offence, to the forfeiture of all their goods, and to perpetual imprisonment.*

The parliament of 1543–44, January 14th, passed a bill concerning the Six Articles, which somewhat mollified the stroke of that terrible scourge — "that whip with six knots, each one, as heavily laid on, fetching blood from the backs of the poor protestants." † This bill forbade private accusations, which might be the result of malice; directed that none should be arraigned for any offence under that act, except on presentment of twelve men, before three or more commissioners appointed to inquire into the offence, or at least three justices of the peace, or other justices; or be arrested, except by warrant from two of the king's council, or two of the commissioners or justices aforementioned; and

* *Statutes*, 34 and 35 Henry VIII. ch. 1.
† *Fuller's Church History*, bk. v. sect. 14.

that all such accusations be made within twelve months after the alleged offence. It further required, that all accusations against preachers for breaking these articles, except in extraordinary cases, should be made within forty days after the alleged offence.*

Fox says: "By the qualifications and moderations of the Six Articles, it may appear that the king began somewhat to grow out of favor with Ste. Gardiner, and to descry his doings; whereby he was the more forward to incline somewhat in furthering the desolate cause of religion, as may appear by the premises, and also by other provisions and determinations of the foresaid parliament. *An.* 1545." †

This modification of the Six Articles was made, doubtless, to check the papists, who were pleased to regard them as a sort of general warrant for the persecution of the protestants. It was, however, no part of Henry's plan to allow either of the great parties in the state an absolute supremacy, but rather, to play off one against the other; holding the balance in his own hands, and keeping both parties in hope and in fear. He was by nature a papist of the most uncompromising kind. Circumstances only made him favor protestantism. These were a hook in his nose and a bridle in his lips, turning him from his natural and desired

* *Statutes*, 35 Henry VIII. ch. 5

† *Acts and Mons.*, II. 479.

course. But when left to himself, he became at once a persecutor of the protestants.

In the year 1544 a litany in English was put forth by royal authority. This may be considered as the first official step towards removing the Latin language from the public services of the church of England. The special design of this movement was, to interest the common people in the processions and prayers, in cities, towns, and parishes, which were ordered by the king about this time, in view of his war with France and Scotland.

In 1545 "King Henry's Primer," in English, and in English and Latin, three different sizes, was published by Richard Grafton and Edward Whitchurch, by the king's special grant. The litany and suffrages in this primer, with slight alterations, have been retained in the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England, to this day.* In the original, the "holy virgin, Mary, mother of God," "all holy angels and archangels, and all holy orders of blessed spirits," "all holy patriarchs and prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, and virgins, and all the blessed company of heaven," are invoked to "pray for us." † And in the "Dirige" the dead are prayed for: "Be merciful to the souls of thy servants being departed from this world in the confession of thy name * * *

* *Preface* to the *Three Primers*, pp. lxi.–lxiv.

† *Litany*, etc., p. 481, in *Three Primers*; *Lathbury's Hist. Com. Prayer*, 8–10.

Lord, bow thine ear unto our prayers, wherein we devoutly call upon thy mercy, that thou wilt bestow the souls of thy servants (which thou hast commanded to depart from this world) in the country of peace and rest, and cause them to be made partners with thy holy servants, through Christ our Lord. Amen." * Notwithstanding these and like blemishes, it was a great point gained to get the royal sanction to the use of the vernacular, in the public services of the church.

In pursuance of his general plan, to keep both the great parties of the kingdom in fear and subjection, the king issued a proclamation on the 8th of July, 1546, prohibiting the use of English books; declaring, "that from henceforth, no man, woman, or person, of what estate, condition, or degree soever he or they be, shall, after the last day of August next ensuing, receive, have, take, or keep in his or their possession, the text of the New Testament in Tyndale's or Coverdale's translation in English, nor any other than is permitted by the act of parliament in the four-and-thirtieth and five-and-thirtieth year of his majesty's most noble reign; nor after the said day shall receive, have, take, or keep in his or their possession, any manner of books printed or written in the English tongue, which be, or shall be set forth in the names of Frith, Tyndale, Wickliffe, Joy, Roy, Basil, Bale, Barnes, Coverdale, Turner, Tracy, or

* *Dirige*, p. 492.

by any of them, or any other book or books containing matter contrary to the said act, made in the year thirty-four or thirty-five; but shall, before the last day of August next coming, deliver the same English book or books * * * to the mayor, bailiff, or chief constable of the town where they dwell, to be by them delivered over openly within forty days * * * to the sheriff of the shire, or to the bishop's chancellor or commissary of the same diocese; to the intent the said bishop, etc., * * * may cause them incontinently [immediately] to be openly burned."

A disregard of this proclamation subjected the offender to "imprisonment and punishment of the body, at the king's majesty's will and pleasure"; and also to "such fine and ransom to his highness for the same, as by his majesty or four of his grace's said council shall be determined," etc.* Then, soon after, as a partial offset to this tyrannical popish proclamation, came out, on the 11th of August, of the same year, the king's letter to Bonner, commanding him to see enforced the decree of convocation abrogating sundry holy-days. †

But Henry's work, good and bad, was now almost finished. His end was near at hand. His account was about to be sealed up for the great day of reckoning. On the 28th of January, 1546-47, after some months of suffering, this great

* *Fox*, II. 496. † *Fox*, II. 511.

and accomplished prince — in whom the hopes and fears of millions had so long centred; whose frowns and favors had agitated so many breasts; who during an entire generation had kept all Europe in a state of feverish excitement; who had been the chosen instrument in the hands of Divine Providence to overthrow the papal supremacy in England, and to weaken its power throughout Christendom — closed his arbitrary and eventful reign of thirty-six years, and a life stained with many acts of ingratitude, meanness, and cruelty, though adorned with many commendable deeds.

The changeable course of Henry VIII., the strange admixture of passion and reason, of radicalism and conservatism, of protestantism and popery, in short, of good and bad, in him, make it extremely difficult to form a just estimate of his character and reign. Sometimes we are disposed to laud him, as almost a saint; and at others, to condemn him, as altogether a sinner. At one time he seems to be driving on the good work of reform with a steady, vigorous, careful hand; at another, equally intent on destroying the work of his own hands. And not only is he thus changeable and uncertain, but some of his acts seem in themselves utterly contradictory. Thus, in the same fire he burns to death both papist and protestant; he condemns as felony the very sentiments of his favorite archbishop, to whom he immediately sends the high officers of his court to administer comfort, and to assure him of his

or, as Fox says, "to cherish,
mate" him.* The last seven
life seem particularly self-contra-
ar with the previous seven years.
le, changeable and passionate, un-
nsistent, as Henry confessedly was,
eventful reign, great, very great
certainly made in the work of im-
great, that, instead of beginning the
rmation, as some have done, with the
vard VI., we should rather regard the
short reign as simply the finishing
reat work.

o into minutiæ, Henry did for England
men had been sighing and praying for
any previous generations, but what no
nonarch before his day had the courage,
s the ability to do, however good his in-
. He broke the galling yoke of popery
e necks of his subjects; he completely
ned the pope's supremacy, and dissipated
antom of his universal power, demonstrat-
e utter helplessness of the poor old sinner,
calling himself "the servant of servants," yet
ned to be king of kings, and to rule the
ons with a rod of iron. He made it plain to
istendom, that, when stripped of his stolen
alia, and deprived of the support of the kings
the earth, the pope was really only the bishop

* *Acts and Mons.*, II. 372.

of Rome, entitled to no more respect, beyond the bounds of his own diocese, than any other Christian bishop; and illustrated the utter harmlessness of his excommunications and curses and interdicts, when unsupported by an efficient armed force. And this was not all that Henry did, though it was much, very much to do. He gave to the English nation the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament in the English tongue! — a boon for which the Lollards had been struggling and dying for more than a century, and which no other English sovereign had ever dared to grant, in face of the fierce and deadly opposition of the Romish church. And in doing this, he laid a broad foundation for the rational liberty, the intellectual activity, and the moral superiority of the English people. Of the important principles and doctrines developed during his reign, particularly such as had reference to the order and discipline of the church, there will be occasion to speak more fully before we close the story of the Reformation.

But here it is appropriate to consider, how so radical a change in the religion of the country could be effected in so short a time; how the English could be induced to change their gods, as they did during the reign of Henry VIII. The only entirely satisfactory answer to this is, that the people of England — at least great numbers of them — must have been prepared beforehand for the change. This preparation had been going on secretly, under ground as it were, for a century or

more; but it was greatly quickened by the Lutheran reformation, which immediately preceded the English reformation, and by the newly discovered power of the printing-press. Good men, who had been driven out of England by the persecution which disgraced the first twenty years of Henry's reign, found refuge in Germany, and there increased their knowledge and strengthened their faith by an acquaintance with the great reformers on the continent, and the study of their works. To occupy their time, and to help forward the good cause in their native land, some of them set about translating the Scriptures, and some of the best works of the continental reformers, into English. These, with Wickliffe's tracts and commentaries, were printed and forwarded to England secretly, in packages of goods, in sacks of grain, and in other covert ways. In London these books and tracts were put into the hands of poor men, ignorant men, and despised men — so the great world reckoned them — who were banded together for the purpose of scattering the precious seed all over the kingdom, even at the hazard of their lives. Some of these good men were detected, and the story of their persecutions and sufferings for the truth's sake is deeply affecting.* Still the

* See *Fox*, II. 209, 211–28, 250–69, and especially the affecting story of Garret, the book-distributor in Oxford and elsewhere, and of his friend, Dalaber, and others, at Oxford, pp. 435–41; also an account of the persecution of Clark, Sumner, Taverner, Frith, Garret, Dalaber, and others, several of them

work went on. If one faithful laborer was cut down, another immediately took his place. Men who had, by the grace of God, been able to grope their way out of papal darkness into the marvellous light which God's own word sheds on the soul, were not to be restrained by wicked laws, or by prisons, or by the stake itself, from doing what they could to bring others into the same glorious light and liberty which they enjoyed. They recognized their deep obligation to Him who had said: "Freely ye have received, freely give." They had found peace and comfort and joy unspeakable in reading God's word in their own mother tongue, and had been helped to understand it by some simple commentary of Wickliffe's or Luther's, or some explanatory tract; and should they not carry these precious books to others, who needed their light and instruction as much as they themselves once did?

As early as 1526, and perhaps before that date, there existed in London an organized club, called "The Association of Christian Brothers," who had in view this very business of circulating Bibles and religious books. "It was composed of poor men, chiefly tradesmen, artisans, and a few, a very few, of the clergy; but it was carefully organized, was provided with moderate funds, which were regu-

connected with Wolsey's college, at Oxford, about 1530–31, in *Froude*, II. 45–70, 84–87. See also *Anderson's* account. — *Annals of the English Bible*, vol. I. sect. 8, p. 87, and onward.

larly audited; and its paid agents went up and down the country, carrying testaments and tracts with them, and enrolling in the order all persons who dared to risk their lives in such a cause."* This Bible, tract, and colporteur association, all in one, doubtless contributed largely to prepare the minds of men for the great events which ten years subsequently broke like claps of thunder, one after another, upon Christendom. The popish bishops strove hard against the quiet, but mighty influence of these Bible and tract distributors. The poor men were hounded from one place to another; compelled to disguise themselves, to hide their heads in friendly habitations, or in the forests; to travel by night, and to resort to various stratagems by day, to escape the bishops' hands; and with all their care, they were not always able to elude the diligence and activity of their persecutors. Let any one read the affecting story, told by Fox, of Garret's persecution — who, though a scholar and a fellow of Magdalen College, did not think it beneath him to traverse the country on foot, and supply the hungry protestants with the Scriptures and other aids to devotion and instruction — or of Ferrar's, another of the Christian brotherhood, if they would understand what these good men were exposed to in doing their Master's work. It

* *Froude's Hist. Eng.* II. 26. He quotes from a manuscript in the Rolls House, in support of his description of this association of protestants in 1525.

will be seen from these stories, that not the Bible and tract distributor alone was subject to persecution, but that the receiver, as well as the circulator of English books, was doomed to bitter pains and penalties. Thus, that little band of brethren in Wolsey's college, in Oxford, to whom Garret carried his precious wares, and who were accustomed to meet and read the Scriptures, and pray together, on the detection of the colporteur were themselves seized, imprisoned, and punished, until death ended the sufferings of some of them.*

The popish bishops tried another method to stop the circulation of "heretical books," particularly Tyndale's New Testament: they bought up the books, and burned them. But this proved a losing, as well as an expensive business; for the avails of these sales enabled the reformers to publish new and corrected editions of the burnt books. And so, in spite of the powers of darkness, the good work of preparation for the English Reformation went steadily on, until the time arrived for the king of England to commence the mighty work of abolishing popery, and introducing the English Scriptures as the standard of religious faith and practice.

* See Dalaber's narrative, in *Fox*, II. 438–41; and in *Froude*, II. 45–70. See also Tyball's confession, and that of other buyers and readers of protestant books, in 1528. — *Strype's Mems.*, vol. I. pt. II. Nos. 17–22, pp. 50–65.

CHAPTER V.

REIGN OF EDWARD VI., 1546–1553. — PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION. — DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED.

EDWARD VI., the only surviving son of Henry VIII., and the only child of Jane Seymour, was proclaimed king January 31st, 1546-47. Edward was born October 12th, 1537, and had been most carefully educated.* His reign, though short, is memorable, for during it the Reformation was fully consummated, so far as the church of England was concerned. Yet, it is not a reign of which Englishmen, not even English churchmen, are particularly proud.

* *Strype*, in his *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, gives a list of Edward's teachers, "happily chosen, being both truly learned, sober, wise, and all favorers of the gospel." First, Cranmer, his godfather, had a sort of general supervision of his education; Sir Anthony Cook, famous for his five learned daughters; Dr. Richard Cox, "a very reverend divine, some time moderator of the school of Eaton, afterwards dean of Christ's Church, Oxford, and chancellor of that university," who instructed him in Christian manners, as well as other learning. In Latin and Greek he had as a teacher "that most accomplished scholar, Sir John Cheke, once public reader of Greek in Cambridge," and John Belmair for the French. These were his principal teachers. "Other masters attended on him for other tongues. But Cheke did most constantly reside with him." — Vol. II. pt. I. ch. 1, pp. 13–16.

Henry had carefully arranged a plan for the government of England during his son's minority, vainly hoping to reign by his *will* when he himself was no more. To this end, he appointed sixteen executors, to be regents of the kingdom until Edward was eighteen years old, assisted by twelve privy councillors, who were also named. But if Henry forgot that he should cease to be king when he ceased to live, and that when he ceased to be king he would neither be feared nor obeyed, his subjects did not; and one of the first acts of these executors and councillors, on assuming the government of the kingdom, was to depart materially from the late king's will by appointing one of their number to be Protector; who should represent the king, and be at the head of the government, though without authority to act independently of his coadjutors, the executors and councillors. Their choice fell on the Earl of Hertford, afterwards created Duke of Somerset, Edward's maternal uncle.

Henry had endeavored to give to the new government the prominent characteristics of his own. Accordingly, the administrators of it were in part reformers and in part papists; the former, however, had the ascendency, and began almost immediately to exert their power in favor of the protestants. Persecution under the Six Articles act was stopped, and the prisoners for conscience' sake were set free. Among these was honest "Old Latimer," who resigned the bishopric of Worcester on the pas-

sage of the Six Articles, and who, after repeated arraignments for his heretical preaching, was finally imprisoned in the Tower, and there remained six years.*

The council also invited home the Christian exiles who had been driven abroad by the severity of Henry's government. Among these were Coverdale, Hooper, Rogers, Philpot, and other distinguished protestants. Several learned foreign reformers were also invited into England, and settled in the universities and elsewhere; among whom were the celebrated Peter Martyr, who was made professor of divinity at Oxford, and Martin Bucer and Paul Phagius, who settled at Cambridge.

Cranmer, who through all the fluctuations of the latter part of Henry's reign had retained the

* Hugh Latimer seems to have given the rulers of Henry's church a good deal of trouble. On the 11th of March, 1531, he was called before the convocation of Canterbury, and pronounced contumacious. But ten days after, March 21st, he appeared again and apologized for his preaching and conduct, subscribed certain articles which were prescribed, and was absolved from the sentence of excommunication. On the 22d of April, 1532, he appeared again before the convocation, and made yet fuller confessions of his irregularities, and was fully restored to the communion of the church. But on the 26th of March, 1533, Latimer's case was before the convocation a third time. He seems to have failed to satisfy the clergy by his preaching and living; and on the 2d of October, 1538, he was forbidden again to preach, by "John, bishop of London." — *Wilkins' Concilia*, III. 747, 748, 756, 760; *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. II. p. 385; vol. III. pt. I. bk. II. pp. 146, 147.

king's confidence and enjoyed his favor, was still archbishop of Canterbury, and was at the head of the executors of Henry's will and "governors to his son and to the kingdom until his son was eighteen years of age," and next to the head of the grand council of state, under the Protector. The measures of religious reform adopted by the council were mainly Cranmer's. It was designed by him and his friends, as Burnet tells us, "to carry on the Reformation, but by slow and safe degrees; not hazarding too much at once." Or, according to old Fuller, they intended to imitate "careful mothers and nurses, who, on condition they can get their children to part with knives, are contented to let them play with rattles; so they [the Reformers] permitted ignorant people still to retain some of their fond and foolish customs, that they might remove from them the most dangerous and destructive superstitions."

In conformity with this "slow and safe" plan, the council early resolved on a general visitation of the kingdom, with a view to further religious reformation.* This was one of Henry's favorite methods. For this purpose, thirty commissioners were appointed, the kingdom was divided into six

* The whole plan seems to have been digested previous to May 4th, 1547, as appears from the king's letter to the archbishop of York, of that date. — *Burnet's Records*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. I. No. 7. But, for some reason, the visitation was not entered upon until sometime in August. — *Burnet's Hist.*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. I. pp. 62-62; *Fuller's Church Hist.*, vol. IV. bk. VIII. sect. 3.

districts, and five commissioners were appointed to each, consisting of two gentlemen, a civilian, a registrar, and a divine, whose special business it was to preach to the people wherever the commissioners went, in order to prepare the way for the intended alterations in religion.* "Articles and Injunctions" were also prepared for the guidance of the commissioners, and printed and sent forth for the information of the people.† A series of twelve homilies, or short sermons, was also prepared, chiefly by Cranmer, and published on the 20th of August, 1547, for the instruction of the people in some of the more important doctrines and duties of Christianity; particularly for those congregations which were served by priests who were unwilling or unable to teach these essential truths.‡

* *Collier*, v. 181; *Burnet, ut sup.*

† For some reason, these were delayed until July 31st, 1547, when they were printed.

‡ *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. p. 54. The title of this book of homilies was "Certain Sermons or Homilies, appointed by the kings Majestie, to be declared and read by all Parsons, Vicars, or Curates, everie Sonday, in their Churches where they have come."

Two editions of these homilies were published during the year 1547, and distributed to the churches and chapels through the kingdom. But they were much disliked by the papists, and the good influence of the homilies was neutralized as far as possible by the conduct of the people or the priests. In some places, we are told that the people would keep up such "talking and babbling in church [when the homilies were read] that nothing could be heard"; and in other churches, where the people were well disposed, and the priest was ill affected, old Latimer tells us, the priest would "so hawk and chop it, that it were as good for them

The "Injunctions" were thirty-six in number. They required that all ecclesiastical persons should observe the laws abolishing the pretended and usurped power of the bishop of Rome, and in confirmation of the king's authority and supremacy; that once a quarter, at least, they should sincerely declare the word of God, dissuading their people from superstitions, fancies of pilgrimages, praying to images, etc., and exhorting them to works of faith, charity, and mercy; that images abused with pilgrimages and offerings be forthwith taken down and destroyed; and that no more wax candles or tapers be burned before images, and only two lights be allowed on the high altar before the sacrament; that on every holy-day, when there was no sermon, the pater noster, credo, and ten commandments, in English, should be plainly recited in the pulpit to the people;* that within three months after this visitation, the Bible of the largest volume

to be without it, for any word that could be understood." — *Strype*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. ch. 5, p. 49.

* In 1547, *Strype* tells us: "There was now great care taken that the vulgar sort might arrive to some understanding of religion, which they were for the most part most barbarously ignorant of before. And for this purpose, provision was made that the people might learn in English the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, Ave, that used always to be said before in Latin; but especially the Lord's Prayer, commonly called the *Pater Noster*. And therefore, the better to inculcate it into the memories of the people, Latimer used to say this prayer constantly, both before and after the sermon, in the country where he was." — *Ecc. Mems.*, vol. II. pt. I. ch. 9, p. 112.

in English, and within twelve months, Erasmus' paraphrase on the gospel, in English, be placed in the churches conveniently, to be read by the people; that all who come to confession in Lent be examined, whether they can recite the creed, pater noster, and ten commandments in English, before they receive the blessed sacrament; that they detect such as are letters (hinderers) of God's word in English; that every ecclesiastical person under the degree of bachelor of divinity shall provide for his own use the New Testament in Latin and English, with Erasmus' paraphrase thereon; and that the bishops or their officers examine them on their proficiency in the study of Scripture; that in the time of high mass the epistles and gospel in English be read, and one chapter from the New Testament at matins, and one from the Old Testament at evening. All processions about the churches or church-yards were forbidden. It was required that the Sabbath be wholly given to God, in hearing his word read and taught, in private and public prayers, in receiving the sacrament, and in works of charity and mercy; that they take away and destroy all shrines, coverings of shrines, tables, candlesticks, trindles, or rolls of wax, pictures, paintings, and other monuments of feigned miracles, so that no memory of them remain in walls or windows; and that a comely pulpit be provided in a convenient place. It was also enjoined, that because of the lack of preachers, curates shall read homilies, which are and shall be set forth by the

king's authority; that no forms of prayer shall be used except such as are set forth in the primer of Henry VIII., translated into English; and that all graces before and after meat be said in English.*

These injunctions produced great excitement among the papists, especially the clergy. Gardiner and Bonner and the Lady Mary protested against any alterations in religion during the king's minority, and urged that everything should remain precisely as left by Henry. The Reformers replied, that the late king had left things quite unsettled in religion, and greatly lamented that he must die before he had finished the work; and that for them to make further reforms was but to do what the late king had intended to do, and what he had left them, as the executors of his will, power to do, in the act of parliament which he had obtained during his lifetime, giving to the proclamations of his son's councillors, while he was under age, all the power which the king's own proclamation would have.†

* *Wilkins' Concilia*, vol. IV. pp. 8–8; *Fox*, vol. II. bk. IX. pp. 5–7. *Fuller* (*Ch. Hist.*, bk. VII. sect. 1) gives a very good abstract of the Injunctions.

† *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. p. 51. *Strype* says, that "this visitation * * * was generally very acceptable to most of the lay people, and grievous only to the clergy, who could not endure to be unsettled from their old ways and courses in the observances of religion." — *Ecc. Mems.*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. ch. 7, p. 83. In another place he tells us that the papists cried out of Edward's doings, as being done in his minority, and done by others, the chief men about him. "They would ordinarily say: 'Tush, this

But though the council was evidently in earnest to promote further reformation in the church of England, its movements were quite too slow for the more ardent reformers. The exiles, who had suffered deeply under the workings of the semi-papal church establishment of Henry VIII., on getting back to their native land inveighed against the remaining impurities of the English church, and earnestly recommended the more simple and scriptural models of church organization and government with which they had become familiar abroad. Some of the clergy and many of the English laity sympathized with these views. Ridley, in his Lent sermons, early in the spring of 1546-47, so preached against images and holy water, as to raise a "great heat over England." Dr. John Haley, of Magdalen College, Oxford, about the same time, declaimed with great violence against the pope and the old tenets. Images, and pictures of saints, and the crucifix, were taken down from St. Martin's church, London; and on May-day (1547) the people of Portsmouth pulled

gear will not tarry; it is but my lord protector's and my lord of Canterbury's doings. The king is a child, and he knows not of it.' But old father Latimer upon this hath these words: 'Have we not a noble king? Was there ever so noble, so godly, brought up with such noble councillors, so excellent and well-learned schoolmasters? I will tell you this, (and I speak it even as I think,) his majesty hath more godly wit and understanding, more learning and knowledge at this age, than twenty of his progenitors, that I could name, had at any time of their life.'" — *Ecc. Mems.*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. ch. 4, p. 88.

down and broke in pieces images of Christ and of the saints.* These Portsmouth iconoclasts were denounced by Bishop Gardiner as hogs, or worse than hogs, even Lollards.† Collier attributes all these unauthorized attacks on old rites and superstitions to "the gospellers, as they were then called," who "overran the motions of the State, and ventured to reform without public authority." ‡

On the 4th of November, Edward's first parliament met. Why it was not called together at an earlier day does not satisfactorily appear; for it was generally among the first acts of a new reign to summon the high court of parliament. The Reformers might have wanted time to mature their plans, send out their commissioners, infuse something of their own spirit into the people at large, and get some returns from the visitors, before meeting a parliament. The feud with Scotland, too, which broke out into open hostilities during the summer of 1547, and which required the protector's personal presence with the English army in the invasion of that country, may have contributed to defer the calling of parliament. However this may be, one thing is certain, the English parliament did not assemble until nine months and more after the accession of Edward VI. to the English throne. But when parliament did meet,

* *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. pp. 17-23.

† See *ante*, p. 5; *Burnet, ut sup.*

‡ *Ecc. Hist. of Eng.*, v. 181, 182. London, 8vo. 1852.

it was found ready, as usual, to do the will of the court in respect to religious matters; and under the direction of the council, it began almost immediately to relax and alter the laws which had borne so heavily on the protestants in the preceding reign.*

The first act which had any reference to religion was introduced on the 12th of November, and relates to the administration of the sacrament of the altar. It condemns the unreverent and ungodly disputations which had been indulged in by some persons respecting that most holy mystery, and the unseemly words which had been applied to it, and threatens severe punishment on all such irreverent persons. It, however, provides that the sacrament shall be commonly delivered and ministered to the people in *both kinds*, of bread and wine, as being more conformable to the common use and practice of the apostles and primitive church, by the space of five hundred years and

* According to "Thomas Hancock, a preacher, who, in the latter time of King Henry and during the reign of King Edward, did much good in Wiltshire and Hantshire, by his diligent preaching the gospel," the people of the town of Pole, in the county of Dorset, "were the first that in that part of England were called *Protestants*." This appears to have been in the first year of Edward's reign. "Which town," we are told, "at that time, was wealthy; for they embraced God's word; they were in favor with the rulers and governors of the realm; * * * they did love one another, and every one glad of the company of the others, and God poured his blessings plentifully upon them." They afterwards, however, fell away, lost their religious character and their secular prosperity. — *Strype, ut sup.* ch. 9. pp. 115, 116.

more after Christ's ascension. Private masses were also prohibited.*

This law, which was accompanied by a royal proclamation, dated December 27th, 1547, against "irreverent talkers of the sacrament," was, like many public acts of this period, two-edged, cutting both papists and protestants. "The sacrament of the altar," as the Lord's supper was called by the Romanists, was a fruitful theme of discussion and disputation. It was a sort of test question between the two great contending parties of the day. The numerous points raised about it, and the earnestness of the discussions to which it gave birth, prove this. For example, we find priests and people vehemently disputing whether this rite, ordinance, institution, was a sacrament or a mass; a commemorative, symbolical act, or an oft-repeated oblation and sacrifice of the very body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ; whether it should be partaken of by all the people, or by the priests alone; and whether it should be administered in both kinds, or only in the bread.†. In respect to all these questions, the law decided against the papists. It abolished the mass, and substituted for it the sacrament of the Lord's supper. It determined that all Christian people were entitled to partake of this commemorative supper, and that

* *Statutes of the Realm*, 1 Edward VI. ch. 1; *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. pp. 84–87.

† *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. I., and Records, No. 25.

it should be celebrated by the administration of the consecrated wine, as well as the bread. But then, the law and the proclamation threatened condign punishment on those who indulged in "unreverent and ungodly disputations" about the holy mystery, and who applied to it "unseemly words." These clauses were aimed chiefly against the violent protestants, or anti-Romanists, who, not content with renouncing the errors of the popish mass, descended to a species of denunciation and ridicule which was little short of downright impiety and profanity. The papists had been teaching for hundreds of years — and burning to death those who denied or even doubted the truth of their teaching — that Christ was not only present in the mass, but present corporally in his real body and blood — that very same body which was born of the virgin, was crucified, died, and was buried; and that body, whole and entire, too, flesh, blood, bones! This was the absurd doctrine of the church, for the denial of which many a poor Lollard, as we have seen in the progress of this history, was burned at Smithfield and elsewhere. The time had been, when even the expression of a doubt on this subject was fatal to the doubter. Now, however, the ban of condemnation being taken off, and the minds of people being freed from the awful constraint in which they had been previously held, they not unnaturally went into speculations about the sacramental presence, which were frivolous, and some of them, certainly, very

irreverent, if not absolutely profane. For instance, they debated, as the proclamation tells us, "Whether the body and blood aforesaid is there really or figuratively, locally or circumscriptly, and having quantity and greatness, or but substantially and by substance only, or else but in a figure and manner of speaking; whether his blessed body be there, head, legs, arms, toes, and nails, or any other ways, shape, and manner, naked or clothed; whether he is broken or chewed, or he is always whole; whether the bread there remaineth as we see, or how it departeth; whether the flesh be there alone, and the blood, or part, or each in other, or in the one both, in the other but only blood, and what blood? that only which did flow out of the side, or that which remained? with other such irreverent, superfluous, and curious questions." * Others went even further than these speculators; and from being compelled to worship "the host" in the sacramental bread, they ridiculed the whole pretence of the papists, speaking of the host, or sacramental wafer, which was kept in a pyx, or box, as "Jack in the box"; and of the Romish sacramental doctrine, which had brought so many men to untimely deaths, as "the sacrament of the *halter*"; and of the round wafer itself, as a "round robin"; and employing other "such like unseemly terms. Though they meant not

* *Strype's Mems.*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. ch. 9, p. 108; and ch. 11, p. 126; *Lathbury*, 14.

these contemptible expressions, I suppose, against the holy supper of our Lord, but only against the papal mass." *

Another act, and one of great importance to the protestants, was introduced on the 16th of December. This struck down at a blow all the oppressive and persecuting statutes, not only of Henry VIII.'s time, but of his predecessors, back to the 1st of Richard II. In the first place, the act repealed all the statutes of the late king, which made any doctrine or matter of religion treason; and of Henry V. and of Richard II., which made anything felony or treason except what was deemed treason by the statute of 25 Edward III. In other words, this act of 1 Edward VI. allowed a man to read and interpret the Scriptures as his reason and conscience might direct, without danger of the halter or the fagot; or, in law language, without

* *Lingard* says, that to neutralize the opposition of the prelates, who were hostile to the bill which legalized the administration of the sacrament of the Lord's supper to the people in both kinds — the bread and wine — the bill was artfully appended to another, which they (the bishops) most anxiously sought to carry, prohibiting, under pain of fine and imprisonment, the application of scurrilous and offensive language to the sacrament of the eucharist. — Vol. IV. ch. I. p. 81. The authors of *The Parliamentary History of England* say: "This bill was occasioned by an irreverent treatment that sacred mystery met with at that time from *the then growing sect of the puritans* and others." — Vol. III. p. 228, 2d ed., London, 1762. "The puritans," so called, did not make their appearance on the stage for several years later than this. But the sort of men of which puritans were made, had been in the church from the days of Wickliffe.

being charged as a felon or a traitor.* Heylyn, the high-church historian, mourns over this statute as one by which "all men were now set at liberty to read the Scriptures, and expound them as they pleased, and entertain what opinion in religion best agreed with their fancies, and promulgate these opinions which they entertained." † The common law for burning heretics, nevertheless, still remained, and was used with deadly effect in two instances, hereafter to be noticed. But what constituted heresy was quite changed. The most important enacting clause of this repealing statute reads thus: — "Be it enacted, that all acts of parliament * * * in any wise concerning religion or opinions, that is to say, as well the statute made in the first year of the reign of * * * Richard II., and the statute made in the second year of the reign of King Henry V., and the statute also made in the twenty-fifth year of the reign of King Henry VIII., concerning punishment and reformation of heretics and Lollards, and every provision therein contained, and the statute made for the abolishment of diversity of opinions in certain articles concerning Christian religion, commonly called the Six Articles, * * * and also the act of parliament and statute made * * * in the thirty-fourth year of the reign of the said King Henry VIII. touch-

* *Statutes of the Realm*, 1 Edw. VI. ch. 11. See *ante*, p. 88, note.

† *Parl. Hist.*, III. 231.

ing, mentioning, and in any wise concerning books of the Old and New Testament in English, and the printing, uttering, selling, giving, or delivering of books or writings, or retaining English books or writings, and reading, teaching, or expounding of Scripture, or in any wise * * * concerning any of the same matters, and also one other statute * * * of the late King Henry VIII., concerning the qualifications of the statute of the Six Articles, and all and every other act or acts of parliament, concerning doctrine and matters of religion, and all and every branch, article, sentence, and matter, pains and forfeitures, contained, mentioned, or in any wise declared in any the same acts of parliament and statutes, shall from henceforth be repealed and utterly void and of none effect."* This same statute repealed the act of parliament which made the king's proclamation of equal authority with an act of parliament. †

Another act, illustrative of the views of the Reformers on the question of the divine right of bishops, was passed by this parliament, on the 20th of December. This act sets forth, "That the way of choosing bishops by *congé d'élire* [leave to elect, obtained from the king] was tedious and expenseful; that there was only a shadow of election in it; that, therefore, bishops should thereafter be made by the king's letters patents, upon which they were to be consecrated; and whereas the

* *Statutes*, 1 Edw. VI. ch. 12. † *Ib.* sect. 4.

bishops did exercise their authority, and carry on processes in their own names, as they were wont to do in the time of popery; and since all jurisdiction, both spiritual and temporal, was derived from the king, that, therefore, their courts and all processes should be from henceforth carried on in the king's name, and be sealed by the king's seal, as it was in the other courts of the common law, after the first of July next; excepting only the archbishop of Canterbury's courts, and all collations, presentations, or letters of order, which were to pass under the bishop's proper seal, as formerly." *

Another act of considerable interest and importance was passed by this first parliament of Edward VI. It gave to the king all the lands, rents, and revenues of such colleges, chantries, free chapels, fraternities, guilds, etc., which had not been in the actual possession of the late king, Henry VIII.; and also, all the revenues belonging to any church for anniversaries, obits, and lights; and directed, that these funds should be appropriated to the maintenance of grammar schools, or preaching, and for the increase of vicarages. Cranmer opposed this bill; for he foresaw, that, whatever pretence might be made of appropriating these revenues to the support of schools and the clergy, they would, in all probability, be squandered among the courtiers and their greedy retainers. He was anx-

* *Statutes*, 1 Edw. VI. ch. 2; *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. p. 88.

ious to preserve these appropriations intact until the king came of age; believing he could then persuade him to devote them to the improvement of the condition of the poor clergy, who, Burnet says, were now brought into extreme misery. The popish bishops also opposed this act; but for quite a different reason. Nevertheless it passed, after some delay, and furnished, as Cranmer feared, rich plunder for the unscrupulous courtiers and others.*

The doings of the council, and the acts of Edward's first parliament, rather increased than diminished the difficulties with which the new government had to contend. The popish bishops and clergy, with the ignorant and superstitious people, and all who loved the old order of things, not only

* *Hist. Ref., ut sup.* p. 93; *Parl. Hist.*, III. 225–29; *Statutes*, 1 Edw. VI. ch. 14. Jacob's Law Dictionary gives the following explanation of the terms employed in this act: A *chantry* was a little church, chapel, or particular altar in some cathedral church, etc., endowed with lands or other revenues, for maintenance of one or more priests, daily to sing mass and perform divine service, for the use of the founders and such others as they appointed. *Free chapels* were independent of any church, and endowed for much the same purpose as the former. The *obit* was the anniversary of any person's death; and to observe such day with prayers, alms, and other oblations, was called keeping the *obit*. *Anniversaries* were the yearly returns of the day of the death of persons, which the religious registered in their obitual or martyrology, and annually observed in gratitude to the founders or benefactors. *Guild* signifies a fraternity or company, from the Saxon, *guildan*, to pay; because every one was to pay something towards the charge and support of the company. — *Parl. Hist.*, III. 225, note.

opposed these changes, and made a hue and cry against all reformation beyond the point to which Henry VIII. had brought the church at the time of his death, but strove earnestly to bring back even the old rites and ceremonies which Henry had abolished. On the other hand, there were preachers and laymen, "lovers of the gospel and laborers after a reformation of the old superstitions," as Strype calls them, who were equally anxious to drive on the work of reform far beyond what the law then allowed. These not only preached and argued against the old rites and ceremonies, but actually laid them aside, and introduced into the parish churches new ones, which were deemed more conformable to the simplicity and purity of the gospel, and more nearly in accordance with the practice of the foreign reformed churches. These proceedings were offensive to the government, and called forth a proclamation, dated February 6th, 1547-48, against "those who do innovate, alter, or leave down [or undone] any rite or ceremonie in the church, of their own private authority; and against them which do preach without license"; except bishops in their own dioceses, and parsons, vicars, etc., in their own cures. And on the 8th of March of the same year, another prohibition, of like character, appeared in a royal proclamation, accompanied with the intimation that the king might "be encouraged, from time to time, further to travel for the reformation," if the ardent innovators could be persuaded to "stay and quiet them-

selves with the king's directions, as men content to follow authority." *

But these proclamations, and all efforts of government, were insufficient to stop the progress of reform. "Even in cathedrals, as well as other parish churches, various different ways of service were used, as well in the morning and evening prayers, as in the office of the communion, and in the administration of the other sacraments." † To remedy this great evil, as the state reformers regarded it, the archbishop of Canterbury and several other bishops and learned men were appointed by the council to examine all the offices of the church, and consider how far any of them needed amendment, and "to draw out a convenient order, rite, and fashion of common prayer, and administration of the sacraments."

This committee of bishops and divines was in continuance of one appointed by Henry, for the same general purpose, and who had made considerable progress before the king's death. The winter of 1547–48 was devoted to this work of reform; ‡ and as the first-fruits of the committee's labors, a new office for the communion was drawn up, and set forth early in March, with the king's

* *Wilkins' Concilia*, IV. 18, 19, 21; *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. II. p. 122, and pt. II. *Records*, No. 22; *Strype's Ecc. Mems.*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. ch. 11, p. 131.

† *Strype's Mems., ut sup.*; *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. II. pp. 126, 147.

‡ *Lathbury* says of the Book of Common Prayer: "It was no hasty performance of unlearned men; more than two years were occupied in its preparation." — P. 25.

proclamation, commanding it to be used in all the churches; and at the same time books containing this new order of service were printed March 8th, and on the 13th sent to all the bishops to be distributed to all their curates. This order for the administration of the sacrament of the Lord's supper was not essentially different from what is now used by the church of England, except that the commissioners "left the office of the mass as it was, only adding to it that which made it a communion"; and the people were left at liberty to make general confession, or auricular confession, as they preferred.* During the same year was published "A Catechism, or Large Instruction of Young Persons in the Grounds of the Christian Religion." It was prepared by Cranmer, and dedicated to the king. Next came from the committee of bishops and divines, the great work of Edward's reign, the English Book of Common Prayer; or the reformed service of the church, set forth in the English language. The first edition was published March 7th, 1548-49. This was not an original work, but a compilation from various Romish service-books and primers, which had long been used in different sections of the kingdom. From these, selections were made and a compilation effected which constituted the Book of Common Prayer of the church of England.†

* *Burnet, ut sup.*; *Lathbury*, 16-18.

† *Burnet, ut sup.* p. 192; *Neal*, I. 96.

The first parliament of Edward VI. was prorogued from December 24th, 1547, to April 20th, 1548, at which time it assembled, but was immediately prorogued, on account of the war with Scotland, to October 15th; when it was again prorogued, on account of the plague then raging in London, to November 24th, at which time it met and proceeded to business; though little or nothing was done until after January 2d, 1548-49.

Among the earliest acts of this session was one, read the third time January 15th, entitled: "An Acte for the Uniformytie of Service and Administration of the Sacrament throughout the Realme."* The preamble to this act sets forth, "That there had been several forms of service, and that of late there had been great difference in the administration of the sacraments and other parts of divine worship, and that the most effectual endeavors could not stop the inclinations of many to depart from the former customs, which the king had not punished, believing they flowed from a good zeal. But, that there might be an uniform way over the kingdom, the king, by the advice of the lord protector and his council, had appointed the archbishop of Canterbury, with other learned and discreet bishops and divines, to draw up an order of divine worship, having respect to the pure religion of Christ taught in the Scripture, and to the prac-

* *Statutes*, 2 and 3 Edward VI. ch. 1; *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. p. 192; *Parl. Hist.*, III. 232-35.

tice of the primitive church, which they, by the aid of the Holy Ghost, had with one uniform agreement concluded on; wherefore the parliament having considered the book, and the things that were altered or retained in it, they gave their most humble thanks to the king for his care about it; and did pray that all who had formerly offended in these matters, except such as were in the Tower of London, or the prison of the Fleet, should be pardoned: and did enact, that from the feast of Whitsunday next, all divine offices should be performed according to it; and that such of the clergy as should refuse to do it, or continue to officiate in any other manner, should, upon the first conviction, be imprisoned six months and forfeit a year's profit of their benefice; for the second offence, forfeit all their church preferments and suffer a year's imprisonment; and for the third offence, should be imprisoned during life. And all that should write, or put out things in print against it, or threaten any clergyman for using it, were to be fined ten pounds for the first offence, twenty pounds for the second, and to forfeit all their goods and be imprisoned for life upon a third offence: only at the universities they might use it in Latin and Greek, excepting the office of the communion. It was lawful to use other psalms or prayers taken out of the Bible, so these in the book were not omitted." *

* *Statutes*, 2 and 3 Edward VI. ch. 1; *Parl. Hist.*, III. 234, 235; *Lathbury*, 18–23. There is still in existence a book entitled

This important act was to become the law of the land, from and after Whitsuntide, or the feast of Pentecost, June 9th, 1549.* It passed, however, as Strype tells us, not without "some struggling and opposition made against it by the old papalins"; though only four lords are known to have protested against it. Before it was enacted by parliament, it was presented to the convocation of the clergy and there debated.† The opinion of the popish priests was probably correctly represented in the remark of one of their number, who styled the English Common Prayer Book "the most devilish thing that ever was devised." ‡ It was, nevertheless, the great and finishing stroke of the English Reformation. Beyond it the church of England never really went; and on it that church still

"The Order of Matrimony," printed, as Lathbury thinks, in 1547, or early in 1548, intended, apparently, to be used as an addition to the old "Marriage Service" of the church, as the "Order of Communion" was to the mass. Though not expressly sanctioned by government, it was evidently used to some extent in the churches. Another book, which seems to have had some currency in the churches at this time, was "A Psalter." It contained all the psalms, several canticles from different parts of the Bible, "the Songs of Augustin and Ambrose, the Crede of Doctor Athanasius," and "the Letani and Suffrages" — the litany of 1544. *Lathbury*, 19–21.

* In point of fact, the new book was in general use as early as Easter-day, April 21st, 1549. *Lathbury*, 27, 28. *Whitsuntide*, a contraction of *White Sunday tide* (*time*), so called from the white vestments worn by the candidates for baptism on that day.

† *Strype's Mems.*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. pp. 186, 187.

‡ "The parson of Grampnal, in Lancashire." — *Strype*, *ut. sup.* p. 182.

rests. And with all its defects, it was a great and glorious step.* Up to that time the public services of the church had, for the most part, been said and sung in a language unintelligible to ninety-nine hundredths of the people.† Even the Lord's prayer the poor sinners had been compelled, until within a very short time,‡ to mumble over in Latin, not knowing the meaning of one petition which they uttered; and very many of the priests who officiated at the altars knew scarcely more of what they said or sang than the poor people whom they deluded with their ostentatious ceremonies. To gather together the mass-books and primers, cull from them the best bits and translate them into English, and place in the hands of the people a book of prayer, administration of the sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies, which they could read and understand, and by means of which they could intelligently engage in acts of public worship —to do all these things was indeed a great and most praiseworthy work. It was to take a long and bold step towards reformation. And could the Reformers have appreciated the true spirit of Christianity sufficiently to have left this reformed

* Some of the more prominent defects of the Common Prayer Book have been noticed in the *View of Congregationalism*, pp. 238–62, fourth edition.

† The creed, the Lord's prayer, and the ten commandments were read in English, and in 1544 a litany in English was put forth by royal authority. See *ante*, p. 144; *Lathbury*, 8, 9.

‡ As late as 1547. See *ante*, p. 159.

and intelligible service to find friends and make its way in the world without enforcement by penal enactments, it would have saved their memory, and the church of England, from many stains, which no human hands can now fully remove. The fatal error of the Church-and-State Reformers was the delusive idea of enforcing *absolute uniformity*. The very title of the act which established the new service-book is "An Acte for the Uniformytie of Service and Administration of the Sacrament throughout the Realme." The attempt to compel unvarying uniformity throughout the realm, the refusal to grant any liberty to worship God otherwise than the law prescribed — this was the great error of the Reformers. And unfortunately it did not die with them, but has been handed down as an entailed curse on the church of England almost to the present generation.

In this matter of exact uniformity the Reformers even outran the very papists; for, previous to the passage of this act, there was no absolutely uniform service in the English church, but a variety of forms of prayer and communion were tolerated, differing in different sections of the country. As the pope permitted this latitude, so Henry VIII. seems to have allowed the churches to disregard all the popish forms and prayers, and to use such others, even in English, as they preferred. So at least we infer from what Strype says, when speaking of the variety which existed in England before the act of uniformity — that "those that liked not

any of these popish forms and Latin prayers, used other English forms, according as their own fancies led them." *

Another act passed by this parliament, February 19th, 1548-49, abolished "all and every law and laws positive, canons, constitutions, and ordinances heretofore made by the authority of men only, which do prohibit and forbid marriage to any ecclesiastical or spiritual person or persons * * * which by God's law may lawfully marry." † Though this act thus definitely authorizes the marriage of all spiritual persons, yet in the preamble the framers pay so much respect to the prejudices of the age as to base the act entirely on expediency; saying, that "it were better for priests and the ministers of the church to live chaste and without marriage," but, inasmuch as "great filthiness of living, with other inconveniences, had followed on the laws that compelled chastity and prohibited marriage, * * * it was better they should be suffered to marry than be so restrained."

It was about this time that David's Psalms were first translated into English metre, and, as Fuller says, "if not publicly commanded, generally permitted to be sung, in all the churches. The work was performed by Thomas Sternhold (a Hamp-

* *Ecc. Mems.*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. p. 134.

† *Statutes*, 2 and 3 Edward VI. ch. 21; *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. II. pp. 81–86. This law was confirmed by an act, 5 and 6 Edward VI. ch. 12, 1551–52, which legitimated the children of priests.

shire man, esquire, and of the privy chamber to Edward VI., who, for his part, translated thirty-seven selected psalms), John Hopkins, Robert Wisedome, etc., men whose piety was better than their poetry; and they had drunk more of Jordan than of Helicon." Sternhold appears to have composed these metrical psalms at first merely for his own solace; but having set and sung them to his organ, Edward heard them, and was so delighted that the composer was induced to publish them and dedicate them to the king.*

The first years of Edward's reign were years of great anxiety and trouble to the government. The youth of the king, the determined opposition of some of the most influential men in the kingdom, the bitter hostility and all but open rebellion of "the Lady Mary," the next heir to the crown, and the uneasiness of the people generally, all together, made the condition of the new government anything but comfortable, and the prospects of the Reformation far from flattering.

The restless state of the common people arose from several causes, some of which were purely secular, some religious. The popish priests took pains to increase this popular disquietude, and, as far as possible, to turn it to their own account

* *Fuller*, vol. IV. bk. VII. sect. 31, p. 72. *Burnet* (vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. p. 194) places the introduction of psalms sung into the English church, about 1548–49. But *Fuller*, *ut sup.*, places it about 1550

against the Reformation. And, on the other hand, the friends of reform inveighed against the old superstitions, and violently urged on further changes, and thus increased the excitement. To counteract these efforts, the council issued the proclamation in the king's name, already noticed, against unauthorized innovations on old rites and ceremonies, and against rash preachers; forbidding any to preach out of their own parishes or precincts, except by license from the king or his visitors, the archbishop of Canterbury, or the bishop of the diocese where the preaching was to be. But this not proving effectual in checking the violence of the agitators, as several of the bishops and many of the parish clergy were bitter enemies of the new religion, the council issued another proclamation, April 24th, 1548, forbidding all preaching except by persons licensed by the king, the lord protector, or the archbishop of Canterbury. And even this failing to stop the evil, on September 23d, 1548, a proclamation came out, forbidding *all* preaching, and in all places. This prohibition lasted but a few weeks. Fuller excuses it, by saying: "We read of a silence for about the space of half an hour, even in Heaven itself."*

But all these attempts of the government to prevent agitation among the people were abortive; for during the very month in which this last proc-

* *Fuller's Ch. Hist.*, vol. IV. bk. VII. sect. 1, § 16. See the proclamation in Fuller. *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. I. p. 166; *Strype*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. ch. 12, p. 141; ch. 15, p. 183.

lamation was issued, the people in Cornwall broke out into open rebellion; and in the following year, 1549, there was great uneasiness and discontent all over England, which finally burst into overt acts of violence. Armed bands, varying in numbers from a few hundred, to ten, and even twenty thousand, ranged the country, threatening the utter overthrow of the government. The exciting causes of these rebellious movements were various and somewhat mixed, as has been intimated. A government proclamation issued in the summer of 1548, points to one prominent cause — the turning of arable land into pasture ground. This had been extensively and ruthlessly done by rich landowners, so that whole villages were depopulated; and "where a hundred, or two hundred Christian people had been inhabiting, and kept households, to the bringing up and nourishing youth, there was, 1548, nothing kept but sheep or bullocks"; and all that land which had before been tilled and occupied with many men, was "now gotten, by unsatiable greediness of mind, into one or two men's hands, and scarcely dwelt upon with one poor shepherd; so that the realm thereby was brought to a marvellous desolation; houses decayed, parishes diminished, the force of the realm weakened, and Christian people, by the greedy covetousness of some men, eaten up and devoured of brute beasts, and driven from their houses by sheep and bullocks." In addition to the royal proclamation, a special commission was ordered,

June 1st, 1548, to inquire into the evils complained of, and to take measures to alleviate them.*

But the council generally do not appear to have been in harmony with the Protector in these movements. The great land-owners, who were implicated in these harsh proceedings against the small farmers, of course opposed this commission; and no effectual relief was afforded the complaining people. Another kindred complaint against these rich land-proprietors was, that they had fenced in the commons, which from time immemorial had been free pasture ground for the poor man's cow or sheep. This was a piece of cruel covetousness, which, while it contributed but slightly to the wealth of the rich, deprived the poor, not only of their immemorial rights, but of an important part of their living, alienated them from the governing classes, and made them willing dupes of artful demagogues, who led them into open rebellion against the government.

These insurrectionary movements, in different parts of the kingdom, though suppressed without very great difficulty, but not without the loss of many lives, occasioned the Reformers much anxiety and trouble, and ought in fairness to be kept in view when passing judgment on their measures.

In the autumn of 1549, rumors were current, that the new church service was to be superseded

* *Strype's Mems.*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. ch. 12. Bk. I. ch. 21, is devoted to these insurrections.

by the old Latin service. The new service, it was said, was the work of the Duke of Somerset, and he having now fallen from his high place, the new book was to fall with him. To counteract these rumors, and to set the question entirely at rest, the council, in the king's name, issued an order to the bishops, on the 25th of December, 1549, and in obedience to it Cranmer issued his mandate to his clergy, February 14th, 1549-50, to this effect: "Whereas the book entitled the Book of Common Prayers and Administration of the Sacraments and other rites and ceremonies of the church, after the use of the church of England, was agreed upon and set forth by act of parliament, and by the same act commanded to be used of all persons within this our realm, yet nevertheless we are informed that divers unquiet and evil-disposed persons, since the apprehension of the Duke of Somerset, have noised and bruited abroad that they should have again their old Latin service, their conjured bread and water, with such like vain and superstitious ceremonies, as though the setting forth of the said book had been the only act of the said duke: we, therefore, by the advice of the body and state of our privy council, not only considering the said book to be our act, and the act of the whole state of our realm assembled together in parliament, but also the same to be grounded upon the Holy Scripture, agreeable to the order of the primitive church, and much to the reëdifying of our subjects, to put away all such vain expecta-

tion, of having the public service, the administration of the sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies again in the Latin tongue — which were but a preferment of ignorance to knowledge, and darkness to light, and a preparation to bring in papistry and superstition again — have thought good, by the advice aforesaid, to require, and nevertheless straitly do command and charge you, that immediately upon the receipt hereof you do command the dean and prebendaries of your cathedral church, the parson, vicar, or curate, and churchwardens of every parish, within your diocese, to bring and deliver unto you, or your deputy, any of them for their church or parish, at such convenient place as you shall appoint, all antiphonals, missals grailes, processionals, manuals, legends, pies, portasses, journals, and ordinals, after the use of Sarum, Lincoln, York, or any other private use, and all other books of service, the keeping whereof should be a let to the using of the said book of common prayers; and that you take the same books into your hands, or into the hands of your deputy, and them so do deface and abolish that they never after may serve, either to any such use as they were provided for, or be at any time a let to that godly and uniform order, which by a common consent is now set forth. * * * And further, whereas it is come into our knowledge, that divers froward and obstinate persons do refuse to pay towards the finding of bread and wine for the holy communion, according to the order prescribed in

the said book, by reason whereof the holy communion is many times omitted upon the Sunday: these are to will and command you to convent such obstinate persons before you, and them to admonish and command to keep the order prescribed in the said book; and if any shall refuse so to do, to punish them by suspension, excommunication, or other censures of the church. 'Fail you not thus to do, as you will avoid our displeasure.'" *

And doubtless with reference to these same rumors, the parliament, then in session, (the 3d and 4th of Edward VI., 1549–50,) passed an act abolishing, and ordering to be destroyed, all books heretofore used in the service of the church; such as antiphonals, missals, grailes, processionals, manuals, legends, pies, portasses, journals, couchers, and ordinals, after the use of Sarum, Lincoln, York, or any other private use. † And all who

* *Wilkins*, IV. 37, 38; *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. p. 294, and Records, No. 47.

† An *antiphon* was a kind of anthem, sung by the cathedral choirs, with responses from the people; an *antiphonal* was a book containing these anthems; a *missal* contained the service of the Romish mass; a *grayle*, or graile, or grayel, was the name of the book which contained the responses sung by the choir; a *processional* was a book of service and directions for processions, which were much practised in those days; a *manual* was a small service-book; a *legend* was a collection of stories about the saints; a *pie* was another name for a Romish *ordinal*, a ritual, a book of religious ceremonies; a *portass*, or portesse, or porthose, was a Romish priest's office-book, another name for a *breviary*, or rather, a small, portable, or pocket book of prayers, etc.; a *journal* I suppose to have been a book in which the religious services of the

had any image which belonged to any church or chapel were required to deface it before the last day of June. An exception was made in favor of the primers, in Latin or English, set out by the late king, Henry VIII., provided the prayers to the saints were blotted, or clearly put out of them. By virtue of this law, visitors were appointed to examine the churches in London, and see that all images were taken down and broken to pieces, or otherwise destroyed or defaced. And the same work of demolition and destruction was carried on in all the cathedrals and churches throughout the kingdom. There was a proviso, however, that images on the tombs of kings, princes, noblemen, and others, not reputed to be saints, should be spared.*

In the year 1550, probably in June, Ridley, who had just been ordained bishop of London, entered upon a visitation of his diocese, giving out a series of injunctions, which, while they illustrate the abounding and childish superstitions of the age, at the same time indicate the progress of the Reformation. In these injunctions, many of the old superstitions are most distinctly condemned. For example, he enjoins, "that none maintain purgatory, invocation of saints, the Six Articles, bedrowls

church were arranged for every day; a *coucher* was probably a register kept in monasteries — in this connection it may denote the arranged prayers and services practised by the monks.

* *Statutes*, 8 and 4 Edw. VI. ch. 10; *Parl. Hist.*, III. 252; Strype, *Ecc. Mems.*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. ch. 22, pp. 288–90.

[bead-rolls — a list of prayers and services], images, reliques, rubrics, primers, justification of man by his own works, holy bread, palms, ashes, candles, sepulchre paschal, creeping to the cross, hallowing of fire or altar, or any other such like superstitions and abuses." But especially emphatic is he in reference to the grand abuse of Romanism — the mass. He commands "that there be no reading of such injunctions as extolleth and setteth forth the popish mass, candles, images, chantries; neither that there be used any superaltars, or trentals of communion; that no minister do counterfeit the popish mass, in kissing the Lord's board, washing his hands or fingers after the gospel, or the receipt of the holy communion, shifting the book from one place to another, laying down and licking the chalice after the communion, blessing his eyes with the sudary [napkin] thereof, or patten, or crossing his head with the same, holding his forefingers and thumbs joined together towards the temples of his head, after the receiving of the sacrament, breathing on the bread or chalice, saying the *agnus* before the communion, showing the sacrament openly before the distribution, or making any elevation thereof, ringing any sacring bell, or setting any light upon the Lord's board. And finally, that the minister, in the time of holy communion, do use only the ceremonies and gestures appointed by the book of common prayer, and none other; so that there do not appear in them any counterfeiting of the popish mass."

Important as these innovations on the old manners and customs and superstitions of the church confessedly were, another injunction follows, even more subversive of the mass than any that has been mentioned: it orders a *table* to be substituted for the *altar*. The essential idea of the popish mass is, that Christ is offered up anew, as a sacrifice for sin, every time the mass is celebrated. Hence, the communion-table is turned into an altar, on which this sacrifice may be set forth. Against this idea one of Ridley's injunctions is specially aimed. He orders, that the altars be at once removed, and "honest tables" be substituted; thus striking down at one blow the whole complicated fabric of superstition built on this pretended sacrifice of the mass. His words are: "Whereas in divers places some use the Lord's board after the form of a table, and some of an altar, whereby dissension is perceived to arise among the unlearned; therefore, wishing a godly unity to be observed in all our diocese, and for that the form of a table may more move and turn the simple from the old superstitious opinions of the popish mass, and to the right use of the Lord's supper, we exhort the curates, church-wardens, and questmen here present, to erect and set up the Lord's board, after the form of an honest table, decently covered, in such place of the quire or chancel as shall be thought most meet by their discretion and agreement, so that the ministers, with the communicants, may have their place separated from the

rest of the people; and to take down all other by-altars or tables." *

And about this same time began another innovation on popish custom, which indicates the progress of religious reform, and the disposition of the people for religious instruction. I refer to the practice of preaching sermons and lectures on week-days and working-days; which, we are told, occasioned a great running of people from neighboring parishes. This was not a government measure. It was in advance of their movements, and contrary to the wishes of the council. It may have been suggested by the "sectaries," which even then abounded in England. The practice, so far as the church of England was concerned,† began in Ridley's diocese; whether at his instigation or otherwise, does not appear. It occasioned a good deal of talk, and excited no inconsiderable interest among the people. It was complained of, and the council directed Ridley to stop all preaching on working-days, on which there should only be prayers. How this was submitted to, is not clear." ‡

* *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. p. 326, and Records, No. 52. The order of the council to Ridley, to take down altars and place communion-tables in their stead, is dated November 24th, 1550. — *Wilkins*, IV. 63, 64; *Lathbury*, 81.

† *Burnet, ut sup.*

‡ *Wilkins*, IV. 63, 64, has two letters from the council to the bishop of London (Ridley), prohibiting week-day preaching: one dated June 23d, and the other June 25th, 1550.

CHAPTER VI.

THE VESTMENT CONTROVERSY. — REMOVAL OF THE OLD BISHOPS. — COMPLETION OF THE REFORMATION. — IRREGULARITIES, FRAUD, AND CORRUPTION.

THE years 1550 and 1551 are memorable as the time when the Reformers began openly to disagree among themselves about the right of the State to enforce absolute religious conformity, even in non-essential particulars. After discussing and settling all questions relating to the offices and general order of service in the church, the Reformers decided, though not without considerable debate, to retain the old garments of the Romish priesthood. It was objected at the outset, "that these garments had been part of the train of the mass, and had been superstitiously abused only to set it off with the more pomp." To this, however, it was replied, that white was the color of the priest's garments under the Levitical dispensation, and was also adopted by the African churches in the fourth century; and that it was a natural expression of the purity and decency which became priests. Furthermore, that the clergy generally were so poor that they could scarcely afford themselves decent

clothing; and that should they attempt to officiate in their ordinary dress, the people — who, from abject submission to the clergy, were now inclined to an opposite extreme, of despising them — would be likely to carry their contempt for the shabby priests to the services which they were performing. So it was resolved to retain the old garments of the priesthood, and to insist on a rigid conformity to the prescribed habits, as well as to the authorized rites and services of the Book of Common Prayer.

The controversy which this decision provoked — which Fuller calls "the saddest difference that ever happened in the church of England, if we consider either the time how long it continued, the eminent persons therein engaged, or the doleful effects thereby produced" * — broke out with violence in the summer of 1550. In May of that year, Dr. John Hooper was appointed by the king's letters patent to the bishopric of Gloucester.† He was a learned, zealous, and devoted man, "bred in Oxford and well skilled in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew." On the accession of Edward, he returned among the exiles from Germany, having been driven

* *Ch. Hist.*, vol. IV. bk. VII. sect. 23, p. 60.

† *Burnet* says: "On the 3d of July, this year (1550) Hooper was by letters patent appointed to be his [Wakeman's] successor." — Vol. II. pt. II. bk. I. p. 152. But the privy council book of Edward's reign contains this entry: "At Greenwich, the 15th of May, 1550, Master Hooper was constituted bishop of Gloucester." — In *Bradford's Writings*, p. 374.

thither during the latter part of Henry's reign. At Zurich, where he chiefly resided, he imbibed the spirit of the more thorough continental reformers. On his return he manifested uncommon ability and zeal as a preacher, being in the pulpit almost every day in the week, and preaching to crowded houses. The appointment of such a man to a bishopric seemed eminently judicious, and indicated quite significantly the disposition of the government. Hooper, so far from seeking this honor, actually declined it when pressed upon him. He was unwilling to take the oath of supremacy in the form in which it then stood — "By God, by the saints, and by the Holy Ghost"; for this he thought was impious, because God only ought to be appealed to in an oath. He also objected to the episcopal habits and ornaments — as the rochet, chimere, square cap, etc. — on the ground that these were mere human inventions, having no countenance from the Scriptures, but brought into the church when in its most corrupt state, by tradition or custom; that they were not suitable to the simplicity of the Christian religion, and were condemned by the apostle as "beggarly elements"; and especially, that they had been invented chiefly to give effect to the pompous and idolatrous celebration of the mass, and were so consecrated in the minds of the ignorant that they were considered essential to the due celebration of religious services. He was willing to wear a decent, simple attire, different from the ordinary dress of a lay-

man; but was not willing to sanction the superstitious notions of the people, that the peculiar habits of the clergy were necessary to the efficacy of religious services — that no priestly act was of any value, unless performed in a priestly dress.

In relation to the oath of supremacy, the young king was so satisfied of the justness of Hooper's objection, that he struck out the offensive words with his own pen.* But it was not so easy to remove the habits out of the way. Cranmer at first objected, that he could not dispense with the authorized garments without incurring a *præmunire*. To this Edward and the council replied by a letter, authorizing the archbishop, and the other bishops who were to take part in the consecration, to dispense with the habits. Cranmer was then disposed to yield; but Ridley, the bishop of London, and Dr. Goodrich, strenuously opposed any concession; declaring that, though "traditions in matters of faith were justly rejected, in matters of

* Hooper may have objected to the comprehensive character of the oath of supremacy, as well as to the appeal to the saints and evangelists. This oath required a bishop to swear to "maintain and defend the whole effects and contents of all and singular acts and statutes made, and *to be made*, within this realm, in derogation, extirpation, and extinguishment of the bishop of Rome and his authority; and other acts and statutes made, and to be made, in reformation of the king's power of supreme head in earth of the church of England. So help him God, all saints, and the holy evangelists." — *Statutes of the Realm*, 21 Henry VIII. ch. 2 (A. D. 1534); 28 Henry VIII., ch. 10; and 1 Edward VI. ch. 12; *Gibson's Codex*, vol. I. pp. 25–27, 30, 31. See also *Soames' Hist. Ref.*, III. 568.

rites and ceremonies, custom was often a good argument for the continuance of that which had been long used"; that "those places of Saint Paul [alleged by Hooper] did only relate to the observance of the Jewish ceremonies, which some in the apostles' times pleaded were still to be retained upon the authority of their first institution by Moses"; that the apostles, though they condemned these things when insisted on as necessary to salvation, yet, when they thought them likely to gain the Jews, both used circumcision and purification in the temple; that the abuse of the vestments to idolatry were no better reason for abolishing their use, than were the superstitious ceremonies used in the consecration of churches, and the baptism of bells, a reason for abandoning their use; and furthermore, that "it would bring the papists over to our church, beholding all things by them used not totally abolished by the spirit of contradiction, but some decent correspondences still moderately continued." *

Hooper replied, that "the doctrine of Paul is this (Gal. iii.): that whosoever recalls things abrogated in Christ, transgresses the will of the Lord; and the same Paul openly teaches, that the priesthood of Aaron has been abolished in the priesthood of Christ, (Heb. vii. viii. ix. x.,) with all its rites,

* *Burnet's Hist. Ref.*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. pp. 315–; also, *Neal's Puritans*, I. 108–14; *Fuller's Ch. Hist.*, vol. IV. bk. VII. p. 66; *Soames' Hist. Ref.*, III. 558–68; *Collier's Ecc. Hist.*, V. 376–84.

vestments, unctions, consecrations, and the like: If, therefore, those shadows of the Aaronic priesthood cannot consist with the priesthood of Christ, much less that popish priesthood, which, even by the testimony of their own books, has been derived either from Aaron or from the Gentiles.* And to compel the Christian to these things (these outward rites and ceremonies) is but to take from them and rob them of their Christian liberty, and by tyranny to set them under the curse of the law, from which Christ, by his death and passion, hath delivered them; and it is one true mark and note to know antichrist by." †

Ridley rejoined: — "All the world should know I do grant the appointed vestments be neither things to be regarded of necessity to our health and salvation, or yet as if without them the ministry might not be done; nor that this use of them is in Scripture; nor that the same doth justify the doer and user of God's holy word. For so to say were indeed to defend the papistical and Aaronical priesthood, both, against Christ's gospel. But all our controversy is this, whether the vestments as they be now appointed by the authority of the church of England, be things lawful to be used, or may be used without a breach of God's law; that is, whether they be things, as of themselves indif-

* *Writings of Bradford*, p. 378.

† *Hooper's Confession of Faith*, Art. 83, in *Bradford's Writings*, p. 394.

ferent, and not forbidden as sin against God's holy word, or no." *

This reasoning in favor of the old popish habits, that custom is often a good argument for the continuance of what has been long used, is still the favorite argument of English churchmen. But, if this mode of reasoning proves anything, it proves too much for the protestant churchman. If antiquity may be urged in favor of the chemire, the rochet, and the square cap, which the Reformers retained and enforced, why may not the gloves, the sandals, the mitre, the ring, and crosier, which they laid aside, be defended by the same argument? And if this argument is good for the dress of the clergy, why is it not equally available in

* *Bradford*, p. 375.

Martin Micronius, a German preacher in London, in a letter to Henry Bullinger, dated London, Oct. 18-20th, 1550, thus speaks of Hooper's troubles: "The other bishops are giving him much trouble. The bishops will not depart a nail's-breadth from their prescribed form of consecration, which is manifestly superstitious. The bishops defend the use of peculiar vestments in the church upon two grounds: first, that they are matters of indifference; and secondly, that they are prescribed by the king's majesty, with whom rests the removal or appointment in the church of things indifferent. Hooper denies, on the other hand, that they are matters of indifference, inasmuch as they obscure the dignity of the priesthood of Christ, and nurture hypocrisy, superstition, etc. Master Hooper has just called on me, as I am writing, [Oct. 20th, 1550,] on his return from court. He tells me that yesterday the Bishop of London [Ridley] was most violent against him before the council, and that he impugned his doctrine and loaded him with the greatest insults." — *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation*, A. D. 1537-58, Parker Soc. ed., Letter 244.

defence of the rites and ceremonies of the ancient church? If some of the relics of popery may properly be venerated for their antiquity, all may be which have the same recommendation; and if so, the English church reformation, so far as the order, rites, and ceremonies of the church were concerned, was a mistake; yea, an unwarrantable revolution; and that bitter high-churchman, Heylyn, was not so far astray when he declared that the reign of Edward VI. was "unfortunate; and that his death was not an infelicity to the church."

Hooper not being satisfied with these arguments in favor of the habits — inasmuch as they were the very arguments with which the papists defended most of their unscriptural rites and ceremonies, as well as dresses and ornaments — still declined to be made a bishop, on the bishops' terms. But this did not satisfy the reigning powers; they insisted that John Hooper, willing or not, should be a bishop of the church of England, and wear the authorized vestments of the office, or else suffer pains and penalties for his non-compliance. To reduce him to obedience, Hooper was first forbidden to preach, which was a severe punishment to a man like him, whose heart was in the work; and he probably employed his pen when he could not his tongue. He was next ordered to confine himself to his own house; but, disregarding this arbitrary order, he was committed to Cranmer's care, January 13th, 1550-51, and removed to the archbishop's palace for safe-keeping. But even

Cranmer's persuasive powers failed to convince Hooper; and after two weeks' trial, he was finally sent to the Fleet prison for his contumacy, January 27th, 1550-51; and there remained, probably, until about the first of March.*

In the mean time, the judgment of Bucer and Peter Martyr on the question had been obtained. These eminent continental reformers, though they agreed substantially with Hooper on the desirableness of retrieving the ancient purity and unaffected plainness in religion and in religious rites, keeping as close as possible to the precedents of holy Scripture and the most uncorrupted ages of the church, yet thought he might, under the circumstances, lawfully and properly wear the Romish habits, with the protest that they were not worn as parts of the old system, but as things commanded by lawful authority, and to promote peace in the church.

After eight months' delay, Hooper, influenced probably more by Bucer and Martyr's opinion and a desire to prevent further contention among the Reformers, than by the sufferings of his imprisonment, consented to a sort of compromise with the ruling powers, to this effect: he should "be attired

* The entry in the privy council book, under date of "Greenwich, 13th of January, 1551," is to the effect, that it appeared that Hooper had not kept his house, and had written and printed a book on the controverted question; and was therefore committed to the archbishop. Another entry reads thus: "At Greenwich, the 27th of January, 1551. Upon a letter from the archbishop, that Master Hooper cannot be brought to any conformity, it was agreed he should be committed to the Fleet." — *Bradford's Writings.*

in the vestments that were prescribed, when he was consecrated, and when he preached before the king, or in his cathedral, or in any public place; but he was dispensed with on other occasions." On these conditions he was consecrated bishop of Gloucester some time in March, 1550-51.* After which he retired to his diocese and devoted himself to the appropriate work of a Christian bishop, preaching three or four sermons a day to crowded auditories, and showing himself in other things a pattern of a good bishop.†

Though Hooper thus yielded, for the sake of peace, to the judgment of others, yet, in yielding, he evidently acted against his own judgment; and the part which Ridley took against him was remembered with grief, if not with anger, until near the close of life. When these two good men were subsequently shut up in prison for the gospel's

* The writ for his consecration was dated March 7th, 1550-51. — *Burnet.*

Fox thus describes Hooper's first appearance before the king (and probably his only public appearance in full canonicals) in the enforced episcopal vestments: "He came forth like a new player on the stage. His upper garment was a long scarlet chimere, down to the feet; and under that, a white linen rochet, that covered all his shoulders; and a four-square cap upon his head. But he took it patiently, for the public profit of the church."

† *Burnet.* Hooper's wife, in a letter to Bullinger, dated April 3d, 1551, says: "I intreat you to recommend Master Hooper to be more moderate in his labor; for he preaches four, or at least three times every day; and I am afraid lest these over-abundant exertions should cause a premature decay." — *Zurich Letters*, Nos. I. XL., in *Later Writings of Hooper*, p. xvii., Parker Soc. ed.

sake, and were about to seal their testimony at the stake, they interchanged letters and became cordially reconciled to each other. Ridley had by that time become convinced of the correctness of Hooper's views in regard to the popish habits, and so had Cranmer and others, who were afterwards sacrificed on the altar of popery.* Fox informs us that when Dr. Brooks, bishop of Gloucester, and his popish assistants, came to the work of formally degrading Ridley from the priesthood — not recognizing him as a bishop — preparatory to his martyrdom, he utterly refused to put on the surplice, and they were compelled to put it on him, "with all the trinkets pertaining to the mass. And as they were putting on the same, Dr. Ridley did vehemently inveigh against the Romish bishop and *all that foolish apparel;* calling him antichrist, and the apparel foolish and abominable, yea, too fond for a vice in a play" — too ridiculous for a buffoon in a play.† And when Bonner and his associates

* Ridley wrote to Hooper, when they were both in prison, in Queen Mary's reign, and about to be offered up: "My Dearly Beloved Brother and Fellow Elder whom I reverence in the Lord. Forasmuch as I understand by your works, which I have yet but superficially seen, that we thoroughly agree, and wholly consent together in those things which are the grounds and substantial points of our religion, against the which the world so furiously rageth in these our days: howsoever in time past, in smaller matters and circumstances of religion, your wisdom and my simplicity (I confess) have in some points varied; now I say, be you assured, that even with my whole heart (God is my witness) in the bowels of Christ I love you." — *Works of Ridley*, Parker Soc. ed., p. 355.

† *Acts and Mons.*, III. 427.

were pulling off the official vestments which had been placed on Cranmer, in order to his degradation, the archbishop said: "All this needeth not; I myself had done with this gear long ago." *

Hooper was not alone, even at the first, in his opposition to the popish garments. Fuller, speaking of the founders of non-conformity, says: "John Rogers, lecturer in St. Paul's and vicar of St. Sepulchre's, *with* John Hooper, afterwards bishop of Gloucester, were ringleaders of this party." † And in John Bradford's Memoir, we read that he too was decidedly opposed to the garments of popery.‡

* *Fox*, III. 558.

† *Ch. Hist.*, vol. IV. bk. VII. sect. 24, p. 62.

‡ "Dr. Ridley, that worthy bishop of London, and glorious martyr of Christ, according to the order that there was in the church of England, called him [Bradford] to take the degree of deacon; which order, because it was not without some abuse, as to which Bradford would not consent, the bishop, yet perceiving that he was willing to enter the ministry, was content to order him deacon without any abuse, even as he desired." This took place in the summer of 1550. — *Writings of Bradford*, p. xxii.

Fuller says, "When Hooper, unwillingly willing, wore those episcopal ornaments, he put on with them a great grudge against Ridley, who enforced him thereunto. Nor were they fully reconciled till their death, in the days of Queen Mary." — Vol. IV. bk. VII. p. 70.

The author of "*A Brief Discourse of the Troubles begun in Frankfort, in the year* 1554" — probably William Whittingham — speaking of Hooper's ordination, "a man worthy of perpetual memory," says: "This man being made bishop by King Edward, there was obtruded by other bishops of the same order, according to this book, a rochet and a bishop's robe. This man being well learned, and a long time nourished and brought up in Germany, as soon as he refused these proud things that fools marvel at, he was cast into prison; and at length, by their importunity overcome; and

Brook, in his Lives of Puritans, goes so far as to say: "Most of the reforming clergy were of Hooper's sentiments in this controversy. Several who submitted to the habits in the late reign [Henry VIII.'s] now laid them aside; among which were bishops Latimer and Coverdale, Dr. Rowland Taylor, John Rogers, John Bradford, and John Philpot, all zealous non-conformists. They declaimed against them as mere popish and superstitious attire, and not fit for the ministers of the gospel. Indeed, they were not so much as pressed upon the clergy in general, but mostly left as matters of indifference."* And from the writings of some of the leading churchmen of Elizabeth's early days, it is quite evident that they, too, were at one time very much of Hooper's mind respecting the episcopal habits.†

This discussion about priestly vestments, though in itself confessedly insignificant, was yet the commencement of a controversy which involved the

relenting, he was compelled, to his shame, to give place to their impudency, with the common grief and sorrow of all goodly minds." — *Troubles*, p. 42, editions of 1575 and 1846.

On this controversy about the vestments, the reader can also consult *Hooper's Later Writings*, particularly his "Briefe and Clear Confession of Faith," first published in 1550, pp. 19–92; and Ridley's Reply to Bishop Hooper, in *Writings of Bradford*, Letters and Treatises, pp. 373–95.

* *Brook's Puritans*, Introd. vol. I. p. 9.

† See the sentiments of Grindal, Jewel, Sandys, Horn, Cox, and others, in the chapter on the Ecclesiastical Opinions of the English Reformers, in this work. See also Appendix, Note A.

most serious consequences. The triumph of the court party in this contest was the first stroke on the wedge which, in subsequent reigns, split the church of England, first into Conformists and Nonconformists; next, into Church-and-State Reformers and Puritans; and finally, into Churchmen and Separatists. It was this asserted right to enforce absolute conformity in all things, claimed and exercised by the reformers of Edward's time, and by them engrafted into the very spirit of the church of England, which occasioned to the good people of England, for successive generations, countless miseries, some of which we shall be called to notice quite fully in the course of this history.

A marked feature of the Reformation at this stage was, the importance ascribed to preaching. The old system relied on its rites and ceremonies, its festivals, processions, and shows of various kinds, which attracted and interested the people, and were well adapted to impress and awe the ignorant. But the Reformers having renounced and denounced this childish and unscriptural dependence on mere outward rites and ceremonies, and having made their appeal to the Bible, as the only infallible guide, it became an object of vital importance with them, to enlighten the people respecting the teachings of that blessed book. There was, however, a great scarcity of suitable men to do this work. The old clergy were to a very great extent incompetent. A partial remedy for this incompetency had been sought in the

preparation of homilies, or short discourses, to be read by the clergy to their people on the Sabbath. This was better than nothing; but it was not, after all, live preaching. And to meet the exigencies of the times, the council in 1551 resolved on a system of itinerancy, by means of which the gospel might be preached occasionally, by some of the ablest and most effective pulpit orators, in different parts of the kingdom. Six eminent preachers were accordingly appointed, as the king's chaplains in ordinary; two of whom were to be constantly at court, and four of them to itinerate over all England and Wales.*

Another reason for this plan of itinerancy undoubtedly was, the real dislike of the Reformation which the clergy generally entertained. All the reformatory movements had been embarrassed and impeded to the utmost by the secret or open opposition of the clergy. They had conformed when

* Edward, in his Journal, under date of December 18th, 1551, says: "It was appointed I should have six chaplains ordinary; of which two ever to be present, and four always absent in preaching. These six to be — Bill, Harle, Perne, Grindal, Bradford." The sixth name is "dasht," as *Burnet* says. It should probably be Knox. For we read in *Strype* (vol. II. pt. II. ch. 29, p. 73): "Now Knox seems to have gone into parts of Buckinghamshire, and that in his itinerary course of preaching. In some places in this circuit, and particularly at Amersham, he took a liking, partly for their forwardness to hear him, partly for their civilities towards him." An explanation of this "forwardness" to hear this faithful preacher may perhaps be found in the fact that Amersham was early famed for its attachment to Lollardy, and that its soil had been enriched by the ashes of several martyrs. See vol. I. p. 542, of this History.

a measure was absolutely enjoined by authority; but never until they had resisted as long as they dared; and their conformity generally was only just sufficient to satisfy the letter of the law. Gardiner, of Winchester, and Bonner, of London, fought the Reformation like demons, inch by inch, and did not cease their opposition until deprived of their bishoprics and imprisoned. They both lived to quench their vengeance in the blood of the Reformers. Gardiner was a learned, crafty, unprincipled politician; a man whom Bishop Lloyd well said, "was to be traced like a fox; and like the Hebrew, to be read backward." Bonner was a foul-mouthed, ferocious creature, who, after advocating the cause of Henry VIII. with such violence that Clement VII. threatened to throw him into a caldron of melted lead for his impudence, set himself against every measure of reform during Edward's reign, and glutted his vengeance during Mary's reign by tormenting the poor saints who fell into his hands, and by sending great numbers of them to the flames.* Other bishops were as unfriendly as Gardiner and Bonner, though not so violent, or so well able to make the government trouble.

* *Fox* paints Bonner's character with a heavy brush; and gives a full account of the trial, or rather repeated examinations, of the odious prelate. — Vol. II. pp. 20–46. He has also preserved many of Gardiner's letters, and the minutes of his examinations, and his answers to the "articles ministered" to him; which prove him to have been a man of great ability, shrewdness, courage, and impudence. — Pp. 53–86; *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. II.

Five of the old bishops, in all, had to be deprived of their bishoprics and punished for non-compliance with the reformatory laws and injunctions, for contempt of authority, for misprision of treason, or other causes, before the government could enforce its measures. These bishops, though imprisoned, were not otherwise harshly treated; though Gardiner and Bonner had done enough, by their sharp speeches and taunts, to provoke the government to punish them severely. Heath, of Worcester, and Day, of Chichester, do not appear to have been violent men; and the particular cause of their deprivation and imprisonment is not very clear. That they opposed the Reformation, in some form, is certain. Tunstall, of Durham, was deprived and imprisoned for misprision of treason, or being privy to treason and concealing the same. He was one of the most moderate of the old bishops, and was Cranmer's personal friend; though he had little sympathy with the great work of Cranmer's life. It is quite apparent, from the entire history of these times, that the influence of all these deprived bishops had been, from the beginning of Edward's reign, against any reformation; and it was the extreme difficulty experienced by the government in promoting any reforms while these dishonest temporizers remained in office, which finally compelled their deposition.* The

* In Edward's Journal, under date of February, 1550-51, we find the following entry: "The bishop of Winchester [Gardiner]

after a long trial was deposed of his bishopric." To und
how long and how patiently the government bore with
and Gardiner, and how hard it labored to induce them to
with the reformatory measures of the Church and State,
but to consult the pages of *Fox*, already referred to. Of
bishop of Worcester, *Burnet* says: "He had hitherto [up to
opposed everything done towards reformation in parli
though he had given an entire obedience to it when
enacted. He was a man of gentle temper and great pru
that understood affairs of State better than matters of re
But now it was resolved to rid the church of those complies
submitted out of fear or interest, to save their benefic
were still ready, upon any favorable conjuncture, to retur
to the old superstition." — *Hist. Ref.*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I.
and 417; *Strype's Mems.*, bk. I. ch. 29, p. 872. Bishop T
was deprived and imprisoned "for consenting, about July, 1
a conspiracy in the North, for raising a rebellion." —
p. 828, note *w*. See also *Strype's Ecc. Mems.*, vol. II. pt. II.
pp. 21–24. Under date of December 20th, 1551, Edward re
"The bishop of Duresme was, for concealment of treason
ten to him, and not disclosed at all till the party did ope
committed to the Tower." According to Edward's Journal,
Bishop Tunstall, of Durham, was deprived of his bish
October 11th, 1552. *Soames* gives a very good account
matter. — *Hist. Ref.*, III. 701–6.

* See *Lingard's Hist.*, vol. IV. ch. 1. Lingard's treatment
Reformers, and their measures during Edward's reign, re
one of Hume's treatment of all Christian men and measures.
motives and their acts are alike subjected to his insinuatio
slurs, and to his imputations, if not to his direct charges.
notable example in his treatment of Archbishop Cranme
VII. pp. 199–205. Pages 17, 68, 71, 73 and 74, 251, 28
303, *et cet.*, of the same volume, also furnish other illustr

papal rule, bishops who denied the truth of popery, or deviated from papal prescriptions, not only lost their bishoprics, but their lives also, and that without mercy.

Burnet tells us, that about the end of 1550, or the beginning of 1551, the Book of Common Prayer was revised; several things having been left in the first edition, not approved by the Reformers, either to draw in some of the bishops, or in compliance with the prejudices of the people, who were fond of their old superstitions.

The parliament which began its sessions January 30th, 1551-52, ratified and adopted the new service-book, and ordered it to be used from the feast of All Saints — the first of November, 1552. The act forbade the use of any other forms or rites whatever in public worship, or any person to be present where other forms were used, upon pain of imprisonment; and required all persons, having no lawful and reasonable excuse for being absent, under pain of spiritual censures, and imprisonment for six or twelve months, or for life, according to the circumstances of the case, to be present every Sunday or holy-day, in some church or chapel where this common prayer and other services were used. To this was annexed a "Form of making Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."*

* Bucer was consulted about this revision of the Prayer Book, and suggested numerous alterations. *Burnet* says, that "in almost every particular, the most material things which Bucer excepted

In 1552 was issued a series of doctrinal "articles, agreed upon by the bishops and other learned men in the convocation held in London in the year 1552, for the avoiding diversities of opinions and stablishing consent touching true religion." In these articles the sovereignty of the Scriptures is fully recognized; the visible church of Christ is declared to be "a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite"; and it is declared, that "it is not lawful for the church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written." It is also said, that "our Lord Jesus Christ gathered his people into a society, by sacraments very few in number, most easy to be kept, and of most excel-

to were corrected afterwards." But *Neal* says, that "they who will be at the pains to read over the abstract of Bucer's book, entitled, 'Of the Kingdom of Christ,' in *Collier's Ecc. Hist.*, II. 296, etc., must be of another mind." *Burnet* gives a summary of Bucer's views of reform. — Vol. II. pt. I. p. 319– Compare *Neal's Puritans*, I. 122, note; *Statutes*, 5 and 6 Edw. VI. 1551–52, ch. 1; *Burnet*, vol. III. p. 390; *Strype*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. ch. 15, pp. 20, 21. The two editions of Edward's Prayer Book, the Primer and Catechism, together with the first Communion Service, issued during his reign, have been published by the Parker Society, in one volume, 8vo. The preamble to the act which established this revised version of the Common Prayer Book sets forth, that "great numbers of people within the realm wilfully and damnably abstain and refuse to come to their parish churches and other places where the common prayer, administration of the sacraments, and preaching of the word" are observed.

lent signification; that is to say, baptism and the supper of the Lord"; and that "it is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one and utterly alike; for at all times they have been divers; and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's word." The book of common prayer, and other rites and ceremonies of the church of England, are said to be, "both of them very pious, as to truth of doctrine, in nothing contrary, but agreeable to the wholesome doctrine of the gospel, and are by all faithful members of the church of England — but chiefly of the ministers of the word — with all thankfulness and readiness of mind, to be received, approved, and commended to the people of God." *

* *Burnet's Hist.*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. I. p. 843; and Records, No. 55; *Wilkins*, IV. 73–77. *Lathbury* says that "Cranmer and his brethren consented, in consequence of the solicitation of some foreign reformers, to a review of the book of common prayer, not because the suggested changes were important in their estimation, but for the sake of peace. The book therefore was submitted to a revision, and certain alterations made. In the communion service new words were substituted at the delivery of the elements. In the book of 1549 the words were — 'The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul,' etc. In the revision, they were — 'Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee,' etc. Prayers for the dead were omitted; all second communions were discontinued; the ten commandments were introduced, and the sentences, confession, and absolution at the commencement of the morning service. There were various changes in the arrangement of the book; several rubrics were altered or omitted, and some were added: certain

In 1552 the convocation of the clergy agreed to the "Thirty-nine Articles" of religion; and thus, according to Burnet, "the reformation of doctrine and worship were brought to their perfection; and were not after this a little mended or altered in this reign, nor much afterwards, only some of the articles were put in more general words under Queen Elizabeth." And the whole remains essentially the same at present.*

It is painfully evident, from the entire history of the Reformation, that there were many base men and base measures mingled with the pure and good in this movement. We get glimpses of the spoliations of churches and church property, from time to time during this reign, which are most disgraceful, and which give significancy to the declarations of Fox, Fuller, and others, that Edward's death, and Mary's subsequent reign of terror, were Divine punishments for the sins of the English nation.

ornaments were enjoined in the first book which were dispensed with in the second; 'no copes or other vestures were required, but the surplice only.'" — Pp. 82–85.

* The Thirty-nine Articles here referred to, and the alterations made in Elizabeth's time, may be seen in No. 55 of *Burnet's Records*. *Lingard* says, that these articles were not sanctioned by the convocation, and that their authority rested on the king's proclamation, and the subscription to them by church-wardens, schoolmasters, and clergymen, which he ordered a short time before his death. — *Hist. Eng.*, vol. IV. ch. 1, p. 127. But *Burnet* says, "The convocation at this time [1552] agreed to the Articles of Religion that were prepared the last year." — *Hist., ut sup.* and p. 403. See also *Records*, as above.

As early as October 1547, the council had addressed a letter to the bishop of Exeter, directing him "to inquire after things belonging to the churches, it having been brought to their knowledge, that sundry persons had lately attempted to make sales of the ornaments, of the plate, jewels, and bells of sundry churches." * In the winter of 1548–49, the council began in earnest their efforts to check the extensive depredations on church property, and to recover the unlawful spoils from private hands. In a letter of directions to commissioners, dated February 15th, 1548-49, appointed to make an inventory of church goods, we are told, that "The king's majesty hath been advertised that a great number of his majesty's subjects * * * have presumed, contrary to his highness' most dread commandments, to alien and sell away, both the vestments, plate, jewels, and ornaments, and in many places the bells and lead also, of their churches and chapels, applying the money thereof either to their own uses, or to such other private uses as themselves listed." The commissioners were directed to investigate these cases of spoliation, and recover the stolen articles, or obtain from the plunderers the value of the articles in money.†

But probably very little was accomplished by this commission. There were too many influential persons interested in these spoliations to make

* *Wilkins*, IV. 17. † *Ib.* 81.

it easy to do anything effectual; and besides, the government itself had its hands full about this time with the rising insurrections all over the kingdom. And during these turbulent times there were abundant opportunities for further acts of plunder, which were, without doubt, improved. In the spring of 1552, we are told, "information was given to the king's council, that much costly furniture which was embezzled, might very seasonably (such the king's present occasions) and profitably be recovered; for private men's halls were hung with altar-cloths, their tables and beds covered with copes, instead of carpets and coverlets. Many drank at their daily meals in chalices; and no wonder if, in proportion, it came to the share of their horses to be watered in rich coffins of marble. And, as if first laying of hands upon them were sufficient title unto them, seizing on them was generally the price they paid for them. Now, although four years were elapsed since the destruction of colleges and chantries, and much of the best church ornaments was transported beyond the seas, yet the privy council thought this very gleaning in the stubble would richly be worth the while, and that on strict inquisition they should retrieve much plate in specie, and more money for moderate fines of offenders herein. Besides, whereas parish churches had still many ornaments left in the custody of their wardens, they resolved to convert what was superfluous or superstitious to the king's use; to which purpose commissions

were issued out to some select persons in every county." *

In the commissions referred to, the king says: "We are informed that great quantities of the said plate, jewels, bells, and ornaments be embezzled by certain private men, contrary to our express commandments in that behalf." The commissioners are therefore ordered to inquire into the matter, and ascertain who are the guilty parties, and "cause them to bring into their, the said commissioners' hands, to our use, the said plate, jewels, bells, and other the premises so alienated, or the true and just value thereof." †

The colleges, chantries, free chapels, etc., the spoils of which the government were now attempting to gather for the use of the king, to pay his pressing debts — or rather, his father's — had been given to the crown by the first parliament of Edward VI. The pretence then was, that these establishments were great nurseries of superstition, as they no doubt were, being founded and supported chiefly for the purpose of maintaining masses, and other religious services in memory of the dead; and that their funds could be much better employed in supporting grammar schools, or preachers, or in helping the poor. These were the

* *Fuller's Ch. Hist.*, vol. IV. bk. VII. sect. 2, pp. 96, 97, Oxford ed. 1845.

† The commission may be found entire in *Fuller, ut sup.* pp. 98-102; also in *Wilkins*, IV. 77, 78; *Burnet's Records*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. I. No. 27.

original pretences under which the chantries, colleges, chapels, and revenues belonging to any church or guild for "anniversaries, obits, and lights," etc., were given to the crown. But the real reason then was, that the executors of Henry VIII.'s will wanted the income of those obnoxious establishments to pay off the king's debts. Cranmer at the time opposed the measure; for he foresaw that neither grammar schools, preachers, nor the poor would be much benefited, and that even the king himself would get only a very moderate share of the spoils, but that greedy and unprincipled men would plunder on their own behalf.* The law was nevertheless passed, and for four years had been working out its anticipated results. And now, when the government commenced its investigations, it was ascertained that some of the plunderers were irresponsible persons, of whom nothing could be recovered; that more of them had so "cunningly carried their stealths" that they could not be detected; and that "many potent persons, well known to have such goods, shuffled it out with their greatness, mutually connived at therein by their equals, fellow-offenders in the same kind." † The commissioners, notwithstanding all difficulties, recovered a considerable amount of property for the king's use. But more than this, they were author-

* See *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. p. 98–; *Strype's Annals*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. chap. 8, pp. 99–102.

† *Fuller*.

ized to strip the churches generally of what they might deem superfluous chalices, or cups, or other ornaments; and this appears to have been done pretty thoroughly, a single chalice or cup only being left to a church.

These robberies of church property, however inexcusable, were but the legitimate fruits of a system of falsehood and fraud which had been practised on the people for centuries. They had seen the priestly hierarchy, by various methods and pretences, gradually absorbing the wealth of the nation. From the meanest mendicant, who went about in his accumulated filth, to the pope himself, the great licenser of them all, who supported his royal state by means of the money extorted from all, the people had been taught lessons of dishonesty; and it was not strange that when the spell of fear was broken, and these plunderers came to be seen in their true characters, as immoral, unprincipled, dissolute creatures, the people thought themselves entitled to divide the spoil of the spoilers, and get back into their own possession whatever they could of the dishonest accumulations of the priesthood.

Strype draws a pitiable picture of the men and manners of Edward's reign. He says: "How good soever Edward was, and what care soever was taken for the bringing in the knowledge of the gospel, and restoring Christ's true religion, the manners of men were very naught, especially of a great sort of them. Among the grandees and

noblemen, many were insatiably covetous. The truth of this appears, not only in their grasping at the church lands, rents, plate, etc., but in their raising the rents on tenants, enclosing commons which had been for generations open pasturage for poor men's cattle, perverting of justice by intimidation or bribery, and finally, by hoarding up all the gold they could get. In fine," continues Strype, "to this pass had covetousness brought the nation, that every man scraped and pilled [pillaged] from other; every man would seek the blood of others; every man encroached upon another. It cut away the large wings of charity, and plucked all to herself. She had chested all the old gold in England, and much of the new."

It is represented as a period of extortion, bribery, oppression of the poor by the rich; when the "commonalty" hated the gentry, and "laid all the misery of the commonwealth upon the gentlemen's shoulders"; when murders were common, and murderers went unpunished; when divorces were scandalously frequent, and when, "above all other vices, the outrageous seas of adultery" and kindred crimes "burst in, and overwhelmed all the world." *

Such is the dark picture drawn by no unfriendly hand, of the men and morals of Edward's reign. But, though the age was undoubtedly a corrupt

* *Ecc. Mems.*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. ch. 28, pp. 181–87. The entire chapter (28d) is devoted to "The Manners of all Sorts of Men in these Times."

one, it may well be doubted whether it was more corrupt than others which had preceded it and which followed it in English history. The prominent reason why the corruptions of this period stand out before us so distinctly, is, that there was more light let in on England during this period than ever before; and in that light, vice appears more distinctly than ever before. Few periods, before or since, have had such a reprover of vice as was old Hugh Latimer; from whose terse, rough, sharp discourses much of our knowledge of the prevailing vices and sins of the times is derived. No doubt, however, wickedness did abound during the reign of the admirable and devout young king, Edward VI., much of which might have been reduced out of sight, if not actually removed from the nation, had that wonderful prince lived to his father's age. He had but just begun to exert an influence on the manners of his age, when he was cut down by death. England had long been proverbial for its turbulent and lawless conduct during the reign of minors; as, for example, during the reign of Edward V., Henry VI., and Richard II., not to instance other reigns. It required the arm of a strong, brave man to hold and guide that great flesh-eating, beer-drinking, war-loving animal, Great Britain; and whenever an inexperienced, or a weak and timid hand was laid on the reins, the beast always knew it and acted accordingly. Edward's reign was no exceptional case therefore. But, besides all this, there

were circumstances peculiar in this case. Edward was brought to the throne in the midst of one of the mightiest revolutions ever witnessed in that kingdom or the world — a religious revolution — a change of religion — a change of gods even. The pope of Rome, who for centuries had been revered in England as the vicegerent of Christ, had just been cast down from his throne, and thrust out of the kingdom, as a loathsome imposture; and all his power and influence, his peculiar claims and rights, utterly repudiated; and all the idolatry of pilgrimages, image-worship, and relic-adoration denounced; in a word, the people had just been cut loose from all their accustomed habits of thought and feeling and acts of worship, and an entirely new system had been introduced, which few thoroughly understood, and yet fewer fully appreciated. The old religion had been taken from the nation, and the new had not become familiar to the people. From a habit of entire dependence on outward rites and ceremonies and a peculiarly consecrated priesthood, the people were now being taught that a man is justified by faith alone; and that the old system was the work of the devil. Under these circumstances, it is not strange — it would have been much more strange had it been otherwise — that there should have been an unsettled, unsatisfactory state of things in the community. The elements had been shaken up most thoroughly, and time was required for them to settle.

CHAPTER VII.

ECCLESIASTICAL OPINIONS OF THE ENGLISH REFORMERS. — DISSENTERS IN EDWARD'S REIGN. — END OF THE REFORMATION.

It has been claimed that the English Reformation was essentially a triumph of Lollardism. A comparison of the sentiments of the old Lollards with those of the Reformers of Henry VIII.'s reign, and even with those expressed in the authoritative standards of faith promulgated by Henry, will, it is believed, demonstrate this. It is not claimed that the English church, as organized and established at the Reformation, was in all respects such as John Wickliffe would have made it, had his strong head and warm heart given it outward form and inward organization; but only, that many of the essential doctrines of the Lollards were not merely admitted by the Reformers to be sound and scriptural, but were actually established by law as the religion of the State.* Though this matter has been already alluded to generally, it may be acceptable to those for whom these pages are

* See Bishop Burnet's remarks on this topic, (*Hist. Ref.*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. III. p. 454,) quoted *ante*, page 106.

specially designed, to have the ecclesiastical sentiments of the fathers of the English church drawn out a little more fully and connectedly, that it may be seen at a glance in what particulars they agreed with the reformers who preceded them in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and with those who followed them in the seventeenth century, and in what particulars these fathers differed from their children, the churchmen of a later period.

1. The Scriptures were recognized by the fathers of the church of England as an authoritative rule of faith and church order, so far at least that nothing contrary to them or not provable from them should be enforced. The publication of the Bible in the English tongue, by royal authority; the setting up of a Bible in every church; and the requisition that the clergy should read one or more chapters in connection with public worship; Archbishop Cranmer's injunctions to the clergy, in 1538, to have, and to study daily, the Bible in the English and Latin, and to encourage laymen to do the same; the proclamation of the king, November, 1539, granting the people generally, "the free use of the Bible in the English tongue," to be read in their houses, as well as in their churches; the declaration of the king: "In God's name, let it go abroad among the people," that "by reading thereof as by hearing the true explanation of the same [the people] might first learn their duties to Almighty God, and his majesty, and one another; keeping always in remem-

brance that all things contained in this book were the undoubted will, law, and commandment of Almighty God"; — all these things show conclusively, that those who had the direction of affairs at the period under review designed to make the Bible the standard of truth, so far as they could have any standard independent of the king's own pleasure.*

This further appears from the fact that the king and his counsellors, in their inquiries of the bishops touching proposed reformatory measures, constantly appealed to the Scriptures for proof; and this not alone in reference to points confessedly essential to salvation, but also in reference to points of order and ceremony in the church. Thus, in the questions proposed to the bishops and doctors concerning the sacraments, they inquire, "What a sacrament is by the Scripture?" "How many there be by the Scripture?" Whether

* See Cromwell's directions to the clergy to "provide one book of the whole Bible, of the largest volume, in English, and the same set up in some convenient place within the said church that ye have care of, where your parishioners may most commodiously resort to the same and read it." — *Burnet's Records*, vol. I. pt. II. bk. III. No. 11. Cranmer's injunctions may be found in No. 12, as above; and the king's proclamation of 1539, in No. 15; and another proclamation of 1541, requiring "the curates and parishioners of every town and parish to buy and provide Bibles of the largest and greatest volume, and cause the same to be set and fixed in every one of the said parish churches," and also regulating the price of the Bibles, and giving directions how they should be used, may be found in No. 21.

confirmation, *cum chrismate*, [*i. e.* accompanied with anointing,] be found in Scripture?" "Whether a bishop hath authority to make a priest by the Scripture, or no?" etc. etc.*

Burnet informs us, that Lord Cromwell, sitting as vicar-general, or king's representative, in the convocation of June 9th, 1536, declared, that "it was the king's pleasure that the rites and ceremonies of the church should be reformed by the rules of Scripture, and that nothing was to be maintained which did not rest in that authority; for it was absurd, since that was acknowledged to contain the laws of religion, that recourse should rather be had to glosses, or the decrees of popes, than to these." †

It may seem a trifling matter to dwell upon — the fact that the Reformers of Henry's day regarded the Scriptures as the end of controversy; but he who calls to mind the fact that in those days the ecclesiastical laws of Christendom recognized "all the decrees of the bishop of Rome as God's word, spoken by the mouth of Peter," and declared that "whosoever doth not receive them, neither availeth them the catholic faith, nor the four evangelists; but they blaspheme the Holy Ghost, and shall have no forgiveness" ‡ — whoever considers

* *Burnet's Records*, No. 21, *ut sup.*

† *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. III. p. 429.

‡ "A Collection of Passages out of the Canon Law, made by Cranmer, to show the necessity of Reforming it." — *Burnet, Records*, vol. I. pt. II. bk. III. No. 27.

these facts, will perceive, at once, that to reject the pope's authority, and to appeal to the Scriptures on any point of order which his holiness had settled, was the boldest heresy, the rankest Lollardy.

The opinions of the Reformers on this head are made still more apparent, by the careful distinction which they drew between such articles of belief "as be commanded expressly by God, and be necessary to our salvation, and such things as have been of a long continuance, for a decent order and honest policy, prudently instituted and used in the churches of our realm, and be, for that same purpose and end, to be observed and kept accordingly, although they be not commanded of God, nor necessary to our salvation."* These "rites

* *Articles Devised by the Kinges Highness Majestie*, published in 1536. Preface, p. xvi. I quote from the "*Formularies of Faith* put forth by Authority during the Reign of Henry VIII. viz. Articles about Religion, 1536; The Institution of a Christian Man, 1537; and A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man, 1543. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, M.DCCC.XXV., 8vo., pp. 388; Edited by Charles Lloyd." These three formularies are the earliest authoritative standards of faith of the reformed English church. They were issued by Henry's command, and signed and commended by the high dignitaries of that church. In this volume, there are two versions of the first formulary: one entitled, "Articles Devised by the Kinges Highness Majestie, to stablyshe Christen Quietnes and Unitie among us, and to Avoyde Contentious Opinions, which Articles be also approved by the Consent and Determination of the hole Clergie of this Realme. Anno, M.D.XXVI."; the other entitled simply, "Articles about Religion, set out by the Convocation, and published by the King's Authority." This last is probably the draught as it came from the convocation; and the other, the same work after it had passed

and ceremonies," and this "good and politic order" of the churches, they allowed not to be at

through the king's hands. The variations are somewhat numerous in the two draughts, but do not affect the sense materially. Burnet prints only the convocation copy, as found among the Cotton manuscripts, not being aware, probably, of the printed copy, by Berthelet, the king's printer, which was found by the editor of the "Three Formularies of Faith" among Bishop Tanner's valuable collection, in the Bodleian Library. See the Preface to the *Formularies*, p. vi.

The "Institution," or King's Book, and the "Erudition," or Bishops' Book, are very much alike, the latter being somewhat more full, and less protestant than the other. Bishop Gardiner, that cunning and "thorough-paced" papist, being more in favor at the time the Bishops' Book was issued, is supposed to have had more to do with it than with the Institution, and to have given it a Romish shading, which the "King's Book" has not. — Preface, *ut sup.* pp. vi.–ix.

In the article pertaining to the church (the ninth) there is a marked difference in the phraseology of the two works, the Erudition being much less Scriptural and protestant than the Institution. The Erudition says: "In our English tongue, by the word *church* we understand not only the multitude of people which be called of God to one faith, be they of the clergy or of the laymen, but also by the same word we signify the place wherein the word of God is commonly preached, and the sacraments ministered and used, and call that the church." — P. 244 of *Formularies*. The Institution says: "This word *church* in Scripture is taken sometime, generally, for the whole congregation of them that be christened and profess Christ's gospel; and sometimes it is taken for the catholic congregation, or number of them only which be chosen, called, and ordained to reign with Christ in everlasting life." — P. 75 of *Formularies*.

Throughout the articles there is an equally marked difference in phraseology. The Institution uses the word *congregation* continually, as synonymous with *church;* whereas the Erudition avoids the use of the word entirely. It defines *ecclesia*, it is true, as "an assembly of people called out from other, as from infidels

all essential to salvation, because not enjoined in the Scriptures. And for the same reason, they admitted that the outward form and order of the church might be changed and modified by the reigning powers. The *jure divino*, divine right of episcopacy, was not then taught, had not then been discovered. The king required his archbishops and bishops, "in their own persons," to "set forth to the people the word of God sincerely and purely; declaring the difference between the things commanded by God, and these rites and ceremonies commanded only by a lower authority." And in his letter to the commissioners appointed to draw up and publish "The Institution of a Christian Man," the king says: "Our desire was (and ye say ye have endeavored to accomplish the same) to have a sure and certain kind of doctrine, not as made by men, but by them searched out of the Holy Scriptures." *

or heathen, to one faith and confession of the name of Christ," but goes no further.

"A more detailed account of these works may be found in Strype's Memorials of Cranmer, I. chs. 11, 13, and 20; in his Ecclesiastical Memorials, I. ch. 41 and 48; in Lord Herbert's History of Henry VIII., pp. 465 and 557; in Fuller, bk. v. sect. 8; Collier, bk. II. pp. 122, 127, and 128; and Wilkins' Concilia, III. p. 817; and more especially in Dr. Laurence's Bampton Lectures, pp. 14 and 189, who has corrected the extraordinary mistakes and inaccuracies of Burnet; in Todd's Introduction to the Declarations of our Reformers; and Dr. Barrow's Introduction to his Summary of Christian Faith and Practice." — Preface to *Formularies*, p. ix.

* *Cranmer's Works*, II. 469. Appendix, Parker Society's edition.

and adaptation to the peculia
toms of different regions, pro
inconsistent with God's wor
tientes verbo Dei." *

2. Two orders of clergy we
Reformers recognized as *jure*

Thus, in "The Institution
or the Bishops' Book, publi
fullest authoritative expositi
order of the church of Englan
time appeared, and which was
ommended by the two archbi
ops, eight archdeacons, and
theology and ecclesiastical a
said: "The truth is, that in
there is no mention made of a
tions in orders, *but only of d*
and of priests or bishops, no
spoken of any other ceremony
ring of this sacrament, but on
imposition of the bishop's han

says, "that there is no mention made, neither in Scripture, neither in the writings of any authentical doctor or author of the church, being within the time of the apostles, that Christ did ever make or institute any distinction or difference to be in the preëminence of power, order, or jurisdiction, between the apostles themselves, or between the bishops themselves; but that they were all equal in power, order, and jurisdiction." *

These doctrines of the Institution respecting the identity of bishops and priests and the equality of all, it will be remembered were among the "heresies" of Wickliffe.†

3. In regard to the nature of the power and authority conferred on church officers, the Institution says: "This office, this ministration, this power and authority, is no tyrannical power, having no certain laws or limits within the which it ought to be contained, nor yet none absolute power; but it is a moderate power, subject, determined, and restrained unto those certain ends and limits, for the which the same was appointed by God's ordinance; which, as we said before, is only to administer and

* Institution, p. 118 of *Formularies of Faith*.

† See *ante*, vol. 1. p. 301, of this work. Another old Lollard doctrine is recognized in the Institution as follows: "It is out of all doubt that the priests and bishops never had any authority by the gospel to punish any man by corporal violence." — *Formularies*, pp. 108, 110. The Wickliffe heresy on this point, one hundred and fifty years before the Reformation, was, "That neither the pope nor any other prelate of the church ought to have prisons wherein to punish transgressors." — *Ante*, vol. 1. p. 297.

distribute unto the members of Christ's mystical body spiritual and everlasting things, that is to say, the pure and heavenly doctrine of Christ's gospel and the graces conferred in his sacraments; and further to do and execute such other things appertaining unto their office as were before rehearsed." *

The language of the King's Book and of the Bishops' Book is, throughout, quite consistent with this express statement in regard to the officers of the church — that but two orders of ecclesiastical officers are *jure divino*. Thus we read of "bishops *and* preachers," of "priests *or* bishops," of "pastors and rectors (as the apostle calleth them)," of "bishops and ministers (or deacons)," of "deacons *or* ministers," and of "priests *and* ministers of Christ's church," as the only *jure divino* officers of the church. Throughout the article on the "Sacrament of Orders," there is a studious avoidance of any implication that there is any distinction in order between a bishop and a priest. A bishop is identical with a preacher, and a priest is identical with a bishop. The words are used interchangeably, continually, as if for the express purpose of confounding the old popish notion, that a bishop was, *jure divino*, something superior to a priest.† The Institution even insists that the title of *bishop* or overseer has reference to their care of particular flocks or churches, and not of one another. Thus: "Surely the office of preaching

* *Formularies*, pp. 102, 103.

† *Formularies*, see particularly pp. 110–23.

is the chief and most principal office, whereunto priests or bishops be called by the authority of the gospel; and they be also called bishops or archbishops, that is to say, *superattendents* or overseers, specially to signify, that it is their office to oversee, to watch, and to look diligently upon their flock, and to cause that Christ's doctrine and his religion may be truly and sincerely conserved, taught, and set forth among Christian people, according to the mere and pure truth of Scripture; and that all erroneous and corrupt doctrine, and the teachers thereof, may be rejected and corrected accordingly." *

And it seems that men of standing and ability in the English church went even further than the standards of faith, in the direction of Lollardism. For Froude tells us, that, among the theological manuscripts drawn up about 1537, "one of the ablest and most liberal papers argues, from the etymology of the word *presbyter*, that lay seniors, or antient men, might, to some intents, be called priests." †

The doctrine that bishops are a superior order to priests (*jure divino*) was a novelty in the church of England nearly fifty years later than this date. "Dr. Bancroft, who was [afterwards] archbishop of Canterbury, preaching at Paul's Cross on February 9th [Neal says, January 12th] in that noted year 1588, told his auditors that Ærius was con-

* *Formularies*, pp. 109, 110.

† *Hist. Eng.*, III. 243, note.

demned of heresy, with the consent of the whole church, for asserting that there was no difference by divine right between a bishop and a presbyter; and that the puritans were condemned by the church in Ærius. The famous Sir Francis Knolls, being surprised at such doctrine, to which they were not in that age so much used as we have been since, wrote to the learned Dr. John Raynolds, who was universally reckoned the wonder of his age, to desire his sense about the matter. The doctor wrote him word, that even Bellarmine the Jesuit owned the weakness of the argument of Epiphanius to the argument of Ærius. As for the general consent of the church, which the doctor [Bancroft] says condemned Ærius' opinion for heresy, what proof does he bring? 'It appears,' he says, 'in Epiphanius.' But I say it does not. And the contrary appears by St. Jerome, and sundry others who lived about the same time. * * * Besides, all that have labored in reforming the church for five hundred years, have taught, that all pastors, be they entitled bishops or priests, have equal authority and power, by God's word; as first, the Waldenses, next Marsilius Patavinus, then Wickliffe and his scholars, afterwards Huss and the Hussites; and last of all, Luther, Calvin, Brentius, Bullinger, and Musculus. Among ourselves, we have bishops, the queen's professors of divinity in our universities, and other learned men consenting herein, as Bradford, Lambert, Jewel, Pilkington, Humphreys, Fulke, *et cet.* But what

do I speak of particular persons? It is the common judgment of the reformed churches of Helvetia, Savoy, France, Scotland, Germany, Hungary, Poland, the Low Countries, and our own." *

The learned Calderwood, in his *Altare Damascenum*, devotes a long chapter to the discussion of this proposition: *Episcopus et presbyter sunt ejusdem gradus* — A bishop and presbyter are of the same rank.†

In 1543 was published another formulary of faith and practice, entitled, "A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Common Man," sometimes called "The King's Book." This work, though substantially the same as the "Institution of a Christian Man," is yet scarcely so scriptural in its teachings; but, nevertheless, is quite clear and emphatic in regard to the question of clerical orders, duties, etc. Thus it says: "As the apostles themselves, in the beginning of the church, did order priests and bishops, so they appointed and willed the other bishops after them to do the like, as St. Paul manifestly showeth in his epistle to Titus, saying thus: 'For this cause I left thee at Crete, that thou shouldest ordain priests in every city, according as I have appointed thee.' And to Timothy he saith, 'See that thou be not hasty to put thy hands upon any man.' And here is to be noted, that, although this form, before declared, is

* See *Calamy's Defence of Non-conformity*, vol. i. pp. 87–89; *Neal's Hist. Puritans*, i. 480–83.

† Chap. iv. pp. 88–221, quarto ed. 1708.

to be observed in giving orders, yet there is no certain rule prescribed or limited by the word of God for the nomination, election, presentation, or appointing of any such ecclesiastical ministers; but the same is wholly left unto the positive laws and ordinances of every Christian region, provided and made, or to be made, in that behalf, with the assent of the prince and ruler. And, as concerning the office and duty of the said ecclesiastical ministers, the same consisteth in true preaching and teaching the word of God unto the people, in dispensing and ministering the sacraments of Christ, in consecrating and offering the blessed body and blood of Christ in the sacrament of the altar, in loosing and assoyling from sin such persons as be sorry and truly penitent for the same, and excommunicating such as be guilty in manifest crimes, and will not be reformed otherwise; and finally, in praying for the whole church of Christ, and specially for the flock committed unto them. And, although the office and ministry of priests and bishops stand chiefly in these things, before rehearsed, yet neither they nor any of them may exercise and execute any of the same offices, but with such sort and such limitation as the ordinances and laws of every Christian realm do permit and suffer." *

In regard to the order of deacons, the Erudition holds the following language: "Moreover, as

* *Formularies*, 278, 279; *Lathbury*, 4, 7, 8.

touching the order of deacons, we read in the Acts of the Apostles, that they were ordered and instituted by the same apostles, by prayer and imposition of their hands upon them. And as for the qualities and virtuous conversation which be required in them, St. Paul setteth them out, in his epistle to Timothy, in these words: 'Deacons ought to be chaste, not double-tongued, no drunkards, not greedy of filthy lucre, having the mystery of faith in a pure conscience.' And their office in the primitive church was partly in ministering meat and drink, and other necessaries, to poor people found of the church, partly also in ministering to the bishops and priests, and in doing their duty in the church. *And of these two orders* ONLY, *that is to say, priests and deacons, Scripture maketh express mention*, and how they were conferred of the apostles by prayer and imposition of their hands. And to these two the primitive church did add and conjoin certain other inferior and lower degrees, as sub-deacons, acolytes, exorcists, with divers other, of the which mention is made, both of the most ancient writers that we have in the church of Christ, after the apostles, and also in divers old councils. * * * And whereas we have thus summarily declared what is the office and ministration which in holy Scripture hath been committed to bishops and priests, and in what things it consisteth, as is afore rehearsed, lest peradventure it might be thought to some persons that such authorities, powers, and jurisdictions, as

patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and metropolitans now have, or heretofore at any time have had justly and lawfully over other bishops, were given them by God in holy Scripture, we think it expedient and necessary, that all men should be advertized and taught, that all such lawful powers and authorities of one bishop over another were and be given to them by the consent, ordinance, and positive laws of men only; and not by any ordinance of God in holy Scripture. And all other power and authority which any bishop hath used or exercised over another, which hath not been given to him by such consent and ordinance of men, (as is aforesaid,) is in very deed no lawful power, but plain usurpation and tyranny." *

Now, although the Erudition, like its predecessor the Institution, contains much that savors of despotism, and somewhat of popery and religious error, still the reader will not fail to notice the effects of "Wicleue learning" in the passages quoted In the document already referred to — a Seri of Questions proposed by the King to the bishe and doctors — the archbishop of Canterbury, reply to Question 12, "Whether bishops or pri were first?" † says: "The bishops and priests

* *Formularies*, 280–82. See also *Neal's Puritans*, I. 81, 82 and *Calamy's Defence*, I. 90, 91.

† On this point, and probably in some other particular mer must have subsequently changed his opinions and hel more nearly in accordance with modern churchmen, as in the Book of Common Prayer and other authorized

at one time, and were no two things, but both one office in the beginning of Christ's religion." The same opinion, for substance, was expressed by other bishops and doctors to whom the question was proposed. "The apostles made both bishops and prestes: the names whereof in the Scripture be confounded." Dr. Cox said: "Although by Scripture (as St. Hierome saith) priests and bishops be one, and therefore the one not before the other; yet bishops, as they be now, were after priests, and therefore made of priests." * The bishop of London said: "I think the bishops were first, and yet I think it is not of importance whether the

which were published in Edward's reign. See *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. III. p. 579; *Lathbury*, 38–40.

* Dr. Richard Cox was a distinguished scholar and divine. He was born at Whaddon, Bucks, 1499. He was educated at Eton and at Cambridge, and was a fellow of King's College. He was invited by Wolsey to become one of his scholars in his new Christ College, Oxford, with Clark, Dalaber, Sumner, Taverner, Frith, and others. His reformatory opinions after a while drove him from his fellowship and threw him into prison. Cranmer, however, became his friend and patron, and he was made master of Eaton school, archdeacon and prebendary of Ely and Lincoln, and dean of Christ's Church. He was appointed tutor to Edward VI., became a privy councillor, chancellor of Oxford, dean of Westminster, and canon of Windsor. He took a prominent part in the compilation of the English liturgy, and was the translator of the four Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistle to the Romans, for "The Bishops' Bible," so called. During the reign of Mary he found refuge in Frankfort. He was a man of high spirit, and much attached to the liturgy which he had helped to make, and caused much trouble among the refugees in Frankfort, by insisting on its use. He died in 1581, aged 82 years.

ing the signification." Dr. Day
tles were both bishops and priest
beginning of the church, as wel
copus as *presbyter* was commo
both to bishops and priests." Dr
" They be of like beginning, and
were both one, as Hierome and
show by the Scripture." *

4. Respecting the rights of the
their own pastors and to exerc
Reformers held the following la
apostles' time, when there were n
by whose authority ministers of
be appointed, nor sins by the swo
was no remedy then for the co
appointing of ministers, but or
Christian multitudes among the
form consent, to follow the advi
of such persons whom God h
with the spirit of counsel and w
times the apostles and others, u

if any were appointed or sent by the apostles or others, the people of their own voluntary will with thanks did accept them; not for the supremity, empire, or dominion that the apostles had over them to command, as their princes and masters, but as good people, ready to obey the advice of good counsellors, and to accept anything that was necessary for their edification and benefit." *

Thus spake his grace of Canterbury. Verily one might almost suspect his lordship of being one of those "gainsayers" of a later period, to whom Wickliffe has been compared. But we have not yet seen the end of my lord primate's "*crude assumptions*." † In his answer to the question, "Whether any other but only a bishop may make a priest?" he is so bold as to assert, that even a Christian people may make their own bishops or priests by election. But the reader shall see Cranmer's own words: "A bishop may make a priest by the Scripture, and so may princes and governors also, and that by the authority of God committed to them, and *the people also by their election;* for as we read that bishops have done it, so Christian emperors and princes usually have done it, and the people before Christian princes were, commonly did elect their bishops and priests." ‡ And in an-

* *Burnet's Records*, vol. I. pt. II. bk. III. No. 21, Qu. 9.

† See Mr. Taylor's learned and rather pretentious work, *Ancient Christianity*, p. 83, Am. ed., where he speaks of the "*crude assumptions* on which the modern Congregational system rests."

‡ *Cranmer's Works*, II. 116, 117; *Burnet, ut sup.* Qu. 11.

swer to the question, "Whether in the New Testament be required any consecration of a bishop and priest, or only appointing to the office be sufficient?" the archbishop goes yet further, and declares that even any consecration, further than an "election or appointing" to the office, is unnecessary. His words are: "In the New Testament, he that is appointed to be a bishop, or priest, needeth no consecration by the Scripture, *for election, or appointing thereto, is sufficient.*"

5. Cranmer further held, in regard to confirmation, that "there is no place in Scripture that declareth this sacrament to be instituted of Christ. First, for the places alleged for the same be no institutions, but acts and deeds of the apostles. Second, these acts were done by a special gift, given to the apostles for the confirmation of God's wo at that time. Thirdly, the said special gift d not now remain with the successors of the a tles."* The very doctrine of Congregational ancient and modern.

Such appear to have been the opinions o celebrated Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbur ing the whole period of the Reformation, a very spring and life of the whole movement as it was a religious reformation. It is tr Cranmer was ahead of most of the divine day in the boldness and scriptural char many of his opinions; yet, it is evident

* *Cranmer's Works*, II. 80 and 117; *Burnet, ut su*

examination of this list of questions and answers from which I have been quoting — occupying over sixty octavo pages — that there were others among the bishops and doctors of that period who were not far behind the archbishop on any point, and even outran him on some points of doctrine. For example, Dr. Cox said: "By Scripture there is no consecration of bishops and priests required, but only *the appointing to the office* of a priest, *cum impositione manuum.*" * Dr. Leyghton asserted, that the power of the keys resided chiefly in the church —"*potestas clavium residet præcipue in Ecclesia.*" And, in another place, "That not only bishops and priests may excommunicate, but any other man appointed by the church; or such as have authority to appoint men to that office may excommunicate." † Dr. Cosen asserted, that "forasmuch as the keys be given to the whole church, *the whole congregation may excommunicate*, which excommunication may be pronounced by such an one as the congregation does appoint, although he be neither bishop or priest." ‡ Dr. Oglethorp agreed with Dr. Cosen, saying: "*Non solum episcopus excommunicare potest, sed etiam tota congregatio*" — not only may a bishop excommunicate, but also the whole congregation; that is, for deadly and public crimes, by which scandal is brought upon the church; not, however, on account of pecuniary

* *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. II. bk. III. No. 21, Qu. 12.
† *Ib.* Qu. 15 and 16. ‡ Qu. 16.

matters (*re pecuniaria*), as was formerly common.* My lord elect of Westminster, Dr. Tresham, and also Dr. Oglethorp, say further, "that the power of excommunication was given to the church [or congregation], and to such as the church shall institute." †

On all the above points, and on many others, the Reformers' sentiments, if not absolutely identical with those of modern Congregationalists, were much nearer to them than to those entertained by Romanists, or even by Protestant high-churchmen.

6. In relation to the sacraments, the Reformers all agreed, "that it is not evident by *Scripture* what a sacrament is, but *mysterium;* that is, a secret, or a hid thing"; but according to ancient authors, many of them agreed in saying that "a sacrament is a visible form of invisible grace"; or, as Cranmer says, "*sacræ rei signum;* viz: *visibile verbum, symbolum, atque pactio qua sumus constricti*"—a sign of a sacred thing; as, for example, a visible word or symbol, and the compact by which we are bound. And then, in regard to the number of sacraments, they all agreed, "that there is no certain number of sacraments by Scripture, but even as many as there be mysteries; and none of these seven called sacrament, but only matrimony in Scripture." And as to the teaching of old authors,

* *Burnet*, vol. I. pt. II. bk. III. No. 21, Qu. 15, 16.
† *Ib.* Qu. 16.

Cranmer said: "the old authors never prescribed any certain number of sacraments, nor in all their books I never read these two words joined together, viz: *septem sacramenta.*" And the bishops of Hereford and St. David's, Dr. Day and Dr. Cox, said, that "this word sacrament, in the old authors, is not attributed unto the seven only, and ought not to be attributed."* Cranmer seems to have received fully, as sacraments enjoined by the Scriptures, only baptism and the Lord's supper; though he says of penance and matrimony he found much said in Scripture; but, "of the matter, nature, and effect of the other three [sacraments], that is to say, confirmation, order, and extreme unction, I read nothing in the Scripture, as they be taken for sacraments." †

7. In answer to the question relative to the power of laymen, in cases of necessity, to do ministerial work, Archbishop Cranmer and some of his associate reformers go as far as any Congregationalist would go. For example, on the question, "Whether if it fortuned a Christian prince learned to conquer certain dominions of infidels, having none but temporal learned men with him, if it be defended by God's law, that he and they should preach and teach the word of God there, or no? and also make and constitute priests, or no?" Cranmer replies: "It is not against God's law;

* *Burnet's Records*, vol. I. pt. II. bk. III. No. 21, Qu. 1–6 inclusive.

† *Burnet, ut sup.* No. 21, Qu. 7.

but contrary, they ought indeed so to do; and there be histories that witnesseth, that some Christian princes, and other laymen unconsecrate, have done the same." Dr. Cox, in reply to this question, said: "It is not against God's law, that the prince and his learned, temporal men may preach and teach, and, in these cases of extreme necessity, make and institute ministers." And Dr. Day said: "In this case (as I think) the prince and other temporal learned men with him, may, by God's law, teach and preach the word of God, and baptize, and also (the same necessity standing) elect and appoint men to those offices." Dr. Redmayne said, in answer to this same question: "I think they might, in such case of necessity; for in this case the laymen made the whole church there, and the authority of preaching and ministering the sacraments *is given immediately to the church;* and the church may appoint ministers, as is thought convenient." *

8. The Erudition defines the catholic or general church thus: "It comprehends all assemblies of men over the whole world that receive the faith of Christ; who ought to hold a unity of love and brotherly agreement together, by which they become members of the catholic church." †

The *jure divino* of episcopacy was no part of

* *Burnet, ut sup.* No. 21, Qu. 15.

† *Burnet, Hist.*, vol. I. pt. I. bk. III. p. 577. Dr. Redmayne "was esteemed the most learned and judicious divine of that time." — *Burnet, ut sup.* p. 575.

the Reformers' belief. Thus the learned bishop Stillingfleet, in his *Irenicum*, first published in 1661 or 1662, distinctly admits that the episcopal form of government in the English church was a *mere matter of convenience;* and adds, that "the main ground for settling episcopal government in this nation was not accounted any pretence of divine right, but the convenience of that form of church government to the state and condition of this church at the time of the Reformation."* And in "A Definition of the Church," corrected in the margin by the king's own hand, preserved by Burnet, after defining the term church (*ecclesia*) very nearly as any Congregationalist would, as having two principal acceptations in the Scriptures — one designating the whole company of saints and real believers in Christ the true Head, who have been sanctified by his Spirit, and the other designating the congregation of all those who are baptized in the name of Christ, and have not openly denied Christ, nor are excommunicate; having thus defined the word church, the paper proceeds to say: "'But, as to forms and religious rites and ceremonies, which, either for the sake of decency or order, or for the purposes of church discipline, are instituted by men, there is no necessity at all that they should be the same everywhere, or be exactly alike; for these may not only be different in different

* *Irenicum, or the Divine Right of Particular Forms of Church Government Discussed and Examined,*" ch. VIII. pt. II. p. 385. Lond. 1662.

No one, it is presumed, wi
simple enough to believe t
Thomas Cranmer, or vicege
any intention of reducing the
the simplicity of Congregati
from this. These men were
at this time, however their
changed afterwards. They b
ward order of the church mi
regulated by the prince or n
Christian country, as seemed l
cumstances and peculiarities o
certainly was Cranmer's bel
reign. And so fully did he a
took his archiepiscopal office
pleasure; and at the decease c
his office, and declined servin
bishop of Canterbury until rea
government.†

* *Hist. Ref.*, vol. I. Addenda. No. 12.

Cranmer and those who acted with him were emphatically the Fathers of the English church. Their ecclesiastical opinions are, therefore, worthy of very special regard, as presenting a striking contrast with the opinions afterwards broached, and still insisted upon, by those occupying the seats of the Reformers. One can hardly avoid feeling that those wise men — wise above what is written — who praise so highly the Reformers of their church, and condemn so roundly the "crudities" of Congregationalism, would do well to remember that the first archbishop of Canterbury in the reformed church of England, and some of the most learned doctors of his day, believed in several of these very crudities of modern Congregationalists; and this, because these good men relied much more entirely on the teachings of the New Testament respecting

among them, made bishops by that necessity, or by authority given by God?" — *Burnet's Records*, No. 21, Qu. 9, *ut sup.*

Cranmer and the bishops of England took new commissions from Edward for their bishoprics. — *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. p. 11; and *Records*, pt. II. bk. I. No. 2.

Lathbury and other churchmen are loath to admit Cranmer's Erastianism; and yet it is not easy to see how it can be justly denied, while the Records from which I have quoted are "not questioned," as they are not. Any subsequent denial of these opinions, implied or explicit, would not affect the archbishop's sincerity at the time he expressed them, any more than his subsequent recantation of Protestantism invalidated his honesty previously. And, if Cranmer entertained the views quoted from his own writings above, then he was an Erastian, whatever he might have been when he indorsed the Book of Common Prayer some years afterwards.

the order of the Christian Church than do many modern churchmen.

Though during the latter part of Henry's reign, and the first year or two of Edward's, there are few traces of dissenting protestant congregations in England, yet we must believe that congregations did exist in secret, for they appeared very distinctly in the early years of Henry's reign, and in the latter years of his son's. Early in 1549, if not before, there were many baptists — or, as they are usually called in the old histories, *ana*baptists, or rebaptizers — in different parts of the kingdom. They were of two classes: unitarian baptists and evangelical baptists. The unitarians were chiefly foreigners — Germans and Dutch; the evangelicals were probably descendants of the old Lollards, some of whom early embraced tenets kindred to modern baptist opinions. Against the latter sort there is no evidence that any particular severities were practised, though all anabaptists were excepted out of the king's general pardon in 1550. Books were written against them, and books were written by them in reply. But this was all, so far as I have discovered. Against the unitarian baptists, however, who are represented to have "denied almost all the principles of the Christian doctrine," and to have been "men of fierce and barbarous tempers," such as had "broken out into a general revolt over Germany, and raised the war called the

Rustic War" — against these, more active measures were adopted.* On the 27th of April, 1548,† Archbishop Cranmer and other commissioners had before them, in the chapel of the "blessed Mary, within the cathedral of St. Paul's," John Champneis, of the parish of Stratford-le-Bow, in the county of Middlesex, diocese of London, charged with certain errors, heresies, and damnable opinions, contrary and repugnant to the catholic faith, which he had not only professed, but set forth in a book.

It is not easy to decide exactly what Champneis, or Champney, actually taught; though it is clear that he was a dissenter from the established church. From his confession — for he seems to have somewhat readily renounced his opinions, after being dealt with by the commissioners on heresy, and bore a fagot on his shoulders during sermon on the following Sunday at St. Paul's — the

* Latimer, in his Lent Sermon, preached before Edward VI., 1550, says: "I should have told you here of a certain sect of heretics that speak against this order of doctrine; they will have no magistrates, no judges on earth; here I have to tell you what I have heard of late, by the relations of a credible person and worshipful man, of a town of this realm of England, that hath above five [hundred] heretics of this erroneous opinion in it, as he said."

Crosby, in his *History of English Baptists*, says: "That the Baptists were very numerous [in 1553] is without controversy; and without doubt many of the martyrs in Queen Mary's days were such, though other historians seem to be silent with respect to the opinion of the martyrs about baptism." — Vol. I. pp. 62, 68. Lond. 1788.

† *Wilkins' Concilia*, IV. 89–42.

believed "that a man regen
that though the outward ma
man sinned not — That there
sons in the Godhead — That C
prophet, and not at all God —

* Champneis' confession and renun
John Champneis of Stratford on the B
dlesex, of my hart and freewill, volu
cerly knowledge, confess, and openly
past I thought, believed, saide, helde, w
sumptuously in my booke sette fourthe
other errours, heresies, and damnable op
say : — First, that a man after he is re
synne. *Item*, secondly, that I have defe
graunting that the outward man might s
cold not synne. Thirdly, that the gos
persecuted and hated ever sythens the
man might be suffered openly to follow h
love falleth never away from them which
Fifthly, that that was the most principa
doctryne, to make the people beleve,
spirite given unto man, whereby he shol
waies in Christe, which is a most develis
God doth

Christ was, that he taught us the way to heaven — That he took no flesh of the virgin — And that the baptism of infants was not profitable." *

On the 28th of December, 1548, another of these unitarian dissenters was arraigned before the archbishop of Canterbury, sitting at Lambeth. His name was John Ashton, a presbyter, and parson of Shiltetington, diocese of Lincoln, charged with sundry "errors, heresies, and damnable opinions," as follows: — "That the trinitie of persons was established by the confession of Athanasius, declared by a psalme, '*quicunque vult*,' etc., and that the hollie Ghoste is not God, but only a certeyn power of the Father. Secundarilye, that Jesus Christ, that was conceyved of the virgyn Mary, was a holy prophet and speciallie beloved of God the Father, but that he was not the true and lyving God, for as much as he was seen and leved, hungred and thirsted. Thirdly, that this onley is the fruite of Jesus Christes passion, that whereas we were straungers from God, and had no knowledge of his testament, hit pleased God by Christ to bring us to the acknowledging of his hollie power by the testament." † These errors and opinions Ashton renounced, and he was discharged.

Early in 1549, complaints were made to the council of the spread of anabaptists and heretics; and on the 12th of April a commission was issued

* *Hist. Ref.*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. p. 229.
† *Wilkins*, IV. 40–42.

these commissioners, and ch
esies, and damnable opinions.
Christ toke no flesh of our
baptism of infantes is not
goeth without faith." These
induced to confess and rei
charged.†

The same commissioners
Joan Bocher, or Joan of Ken
with belonging to the *detest*
secta.‡ Joan was a shrewd,
of unusual intelligence, but o
very abusive and all but frar
tongue. She had been an a
days of Henry; and is charge
gled into the king's own palace
concealed under her dress. B
in some philosophical speculat
nation of Christ, which expos
of denying his proper human
that "she denied that Christ w

none of it; but the Word, by the consent of the inward man in the virgin, took flesh of her." * Joan, nevertheless, believed in the humanity of Christ, though she denied that he received his humanity from the flesh of the virgin Mary. She said, Christ passed through the virgin, as light through glass, and received his humanity in some manner unknown, and undefined in the Scriptures.†

Whatever her opinions were, she held them most tenaciously, and defended them with much adroitness. The archbishop seems to have been very unwilling to give her up, and labored long and earnestly to dissuade her from her opinions; but all in vain. She railed against the bishops, and met her sentence, April 30th, 1549, and her cruel death at the stake, May 3d, 1550, with unflinching courage,‡ but in a way so frantic, that it is strange that she had not rather been taken to Bedlam than to Smithfield.

On the 18th of January, 1550-51, another commission was ordered, to inquire into the errors of the anabaptists and freethinkers (*anabaptistarum et libertionorum errores*) and other heretics. This commission consisted of Cranmer and thirty-one

* *Hist. Ref., ut sup.* pp. 229–31; Records, No. 35.

† See the *Biographical Notice of Roger Hutchinson*, who visited Joan in prison, prefixed to his works, published by the Parker Society.

‡ She was kept in confinement a year after her condemnation, with the hope that she would relent. — *Burnet, ut sup.* p. 281.

" the Father was only God
not very God." He mainta
great constancy, was conde
heretic, given up to the secu
April, and burned to death
25th of April.† " He suffere
great constancy of mind, an
the fagots that were to burn
sented to have been a man
character, and of devotional
to add, that this was the la
persecution unto death in
while we utterly condemn th
lence towards dissenters, it i
formers of this reign, to rem
sessed of power almost as
king's, and educated to reg
even death itself, perfectly
well as expedient, in cases of
they stained their hands with
poor heretics, namely, Joan

ward's reign; and their heresies were considered as peculiarly hateful and dangerous, tending to the utter subversion of Christianity itself.

But opposition to the doctrines and orders of the church of England was not confined to isolated individuals. The appointment of these several commissions, and the number and the character of the men who sat upon them — being among the most distinguished men in Church and State — suggest as much. Had not serious danger been apprehended from these dissenters, they would probably have been left to the regular ecclesiastical courts. And when we examine carefully the history of these eventful times, we find intimations that there were not only many "sectaries," as they are called, but organized congregations of dissenters in different parts of the kingdom.

It was among the topics of inquiry addressed by the bishops to their clergy, "Whether any anabaptist or others used private conventicles, with different opinions and forms from those established by law?" * And Fox tells us of whole congregations of these sectaries in Essex and Kent, at Bocking, Feversham, and other places. Strype says, that during the year 1550, "in the further parts of Essex were many earnest gospellers. And for their better edification, they procured preachers sometimes to preach to them on the week-days." † He

* See Bishop Ridley's Inquiries, addressed to his clergy in 1550, in *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. p. 325–; Records, No. 52.

† *Ecc. Mems.*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. I. ch. 27, p. 341.

also tells us, that "sectaries appeared now in Essex and Kent, sheltering themselves under the profession of the gospel; of whom complaint was made to the council. These were the first that made separation from the reformed church of England, having gathered congregations of their own. The congregation in Essex was mentioned to be at Bocking; that in Kent was at Feversham, as I learn from an old register. From whence I also collect that they held the opinions of the anabaptists and Pelagians; that there were contributions made among them for the better maintaining of their congregations; that the members of the congregation in Kent went over unto the congregation in Essex, to instruct and to join with them; and that they had their meetings in Kent in divers places beside Feversham. Their teachers and divers of them were taken up, and found sureties for their appearance, and at length brought into the ecclesiastical court, where they were examined in forty-six articles or more." * "But beside these sectaries, there was information sent to the court in June this year [1550] of another sort in Essex; but they, as it seems, more harmless; namely, certain that came together on other days besides Sundays and holy-days, to hear sermons, who had preachers that then preached to them; and that, for aught I perceive, was all their fault; for I do not find any false doctrine or sedition laid to their

* *Ecc. Mems., ut sup.* ch. 29, pp. 869, 870, 885.

charge. The Lord Chancellor Rich, who was no favorer of the gospel, being, as it seems, at one of his houses in Essex, sent word of this to the council, showing the danger of this practice, as being likely to breed the common people up in a neglect of their ordinary callings, and an indulging of themselves to idleness. But I suppose the truth was, he was afraid the knowledge of the gospel should spread too much." *

On the 23d of June, the council issued an order to the bishop of London to stop these irregular proceedings. The orders of council seem not, however, to have been effectual in breaking up the congregations of anabaptists and such like sectaries who showed themselves in Kent and Essex; for in January, 1550-51, we are told, that "a special commission was issued forth against them, from the king, to one-and-thirty persons," at the head of which was Cranmer. These commissioners, or three of them, were authorized "to correct and punish all anabaptists, and such as did not duly administer the sacraments according to the Book of Common Prayer set forth by the king's majesty." † But still the sectaries flourished; for as late as October, 1552, another commission was issued to the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishop of London, and others, for the examination and punishment of erroneous opinions in religion. We have no evidence, however, that the dissenting con-

* *Strype, ut sup.* † *Ecc. Mems., ut sup.* p. 885.

tle, kindly spirit, he was ent
of any kind. And then, his
eral and catholic, that he wo
the last men to enforce pains
honest Christian dissenter.
advance of most of his clerg
views of doctrine, religiou
And there is no reliable ev
ever sought the death of an
severe punishment. This is s
edge of the obloquy which tl
still bears for the part he is
the punishment of that hal
Bocher, or Joan of Kent, of v
have made the most. The fa
gist, Fox, has unwittingly fu
of the archbishop with their c
the good prelate. In his acc
dom of Joan, Fox makes the
"When Joan Bocher should
council could not move him

life, as to cause the king to put to his hand, saying, that he would lay all the charge thereof upon Cranmer before God."* Soames calls in question the truth of Fox's statement. He alludes to the fact that Cranmer was not present at the council board on the day that Joan was sentenced; that Edward makes no allusion to this reported conference between him and Cranmer, though he mentions the fact of Joan's condemnation, etc., in his Journal; which he could scarcely have failed to do had any such conversation as Fox reports between the king and the archbishop actually occurred.† And in the biographical sketch of Roger Hutchinson, the editor satisfactorily shows that Fox must have been mistaken in his report about Cranmer's interview with Edward, to persuade him to sign Joan's death-warrant; and that there is really no foundation whatever for this charge against the archbishop, which the enemies of the Reformation, and of Cranmer especially, have used so effectually against him.‡

* *Acts and Mons.*, II. 2.

† *Soames' Hist. Ref.*, III. 442–45.

‡ See *Works of Hutchinson*, Biog. Notice, pp. i.–v. Parres is doubtless referred to in the following entry in Edward's Journal under date of April 11th, 1551: "A certain Arrian, of the strangers, a Dutchman, being excommunicated by the congregation of his countrymen, was, after long disputation, condemned to the fire."

Another entry in Edward's Journal reads thus: "May 2d, 1550—Joan Bocher, otherwise called Joan of Kent, was burnt, for holding 'That Christ was not incarnate of the Virgin Mary'; being condemned the year before, but kept, in hope of conversion; and



that effect. Though these
only martyrs to religious o
their deaths have left a dee
reformers of that period, w
wipe away if it were in our
may be palliated by variou
must be confessed that in t
acted in the spirit of pop
which was the great objec
mer must bear the reproa
these unitarian baptists, Bo
secular arm to be punishe
must be the penalty of th
must bear this load; for, th
of the commissioners — the
the case of Bocher, and seve
— yet, being at the head of
doubtless could have saved t
nestly tried. But the charg
yond the simple line of his s
ing and condemning these

We have now reached the utmost limits of the English Reformation. The death, by consumption, of "that incomparable young prince," Edward VI, on the 6th of July, 1553, in the sixteenth year of his age, after a reign of six years, five months, and six days, not only checked all further attempts at reform, but made way for a papal successor and the utter overthrow of English protestantism.* Had Edward lived to the age of his

* In *Lodge's Illustrations of British History*, etc., are letters from the privy council to the English ambassadors at the French and Imperial courts, in one of which the death of Edward VI. is thus spoken of: "In one word, we must tell you a great heap of infelicity. God hathe called out of this world our sovereign Lord, the sixth of this month. The disease of which his majesty died, was the disease of the lungs, which had in them two great ulcers, and were putrified, by means whereof he fell into a consumption, and so hath he wasted, being utterly incurable." — Vol. I. p. 180. Quarto, London, 1791.

Strype (Anno 1553) says: "The last winter the king fell sick of a cough, which brought him into a consumption of the lungs; and so he lingered, and grew worse and worse." * * * "That he died by poison would not out of the people's minds and mouths." But this report the council authoritatively contradicted. "His disease whereof he died," they said, "was of the putrefaction of the lungs, being utterly uncurable of this evil." And Dr. Haddon, a court physician, some twenty years after, replied to this charge when urged by a Portuguese bishop, that "the physicians reported that he died of consumption. The same was affirmed by the grooms of his privy chamber, which did keep continual watch with the sick king." — *Ecc. Mems.*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. p. 117. For notices of Edward's character, see *Strype's Memorials*, vol. II. pt. I. bks. I. and II.; vol. II. pt. II. pp. 117–; *Fox's Acts and Mons.*, vol. II. bk. IX.; *Fuller's Ch. Hist.*, bk. VII. sect. 2; *Burnet's Hist. Ref.*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. I. pp. 1–5, 453–65; *Kennet's Hist. Eng.*, vol. II. p. 274.

father, English history would not have read as it now does. But the inscrutable purposes of God required the early removal of the wise and good king, and the enthronement of that odious woman, Mary Stuart.

Having now briefly examined the work of reformation during the reign of Edward VI., it may be satisfactory, before we pass to another chapter, to pause and consider what progress had really been made in the reformation of religion from the point at which Henry VIII. left it.

During the brief reign of the devout young king, the churches were purged of images; masses for the dead were put down by public authority — though the late king had left six hundred pounds sterling to support daily masses at his tomb and four obits and four sermons yearly; homilies in English, containing sound religious instruction, were published and ordered to be read in all the churches; the persecuting laws against protestants were all repealed; the communion was ordered to be administered to all Christian people in both kinds, and a table substituted for an altar; auricular confession was no longer required; a sort of catechism, in English, adapted to instruct the young in the principles of religion, was published by authority in 1547, and another in May, 1553, and ordered to be taught in schools;* a new liturgy, in English, was prepared, and the Book of

* *Collier*, v. 497.

Common Prayer, all in English, published and given to the churches for their directory in public worship; the translation of David's psalms into verse was made, and the singing of them in public worship encouraged; the gospel was freely preached all over England, by the most faithful and competent divines; doctrinal articles of religion were adopted and published, such as have been, for substance, approved of and adopted by protestant Christians to this day; thirty-five editions of the New Testament and thirteen of the entire Bible in English were published by authority, and the Bible was "not only suffered to be read by particular persons, but ordered to be read over yearly in the congregation, as a principal part of divine service."* There were also three editions of Erasmus' Paraphrase of the New Testament, in part or entire, translated into English, published during this reign, though the work had been commenced during the preceding reign. Cranmer prepared a treatise in Latin on Tradition, containing a collection of passages from Scripture and from the Fathers, to prove the sufficiency of Holy Writ as the source of religious knowledge, and the incompetence of everything else to establish articles of faith not evidently deducible from the sacred record. These were the prominent reformatory measures of Edward's reign; and they were nearly all an advance, in the

* *Anderson*, II. 244, and Index, pp. xi.–xiii.; *Fuller's Ch. Hist.*, bk. VII. p. 28.

views entertained by the R
"1. In matters of faith the fi
the doctrine of St. Austin
points of original sin, prede
by faith alone, effectual gra
2. They were not satisfied
cipline of the church, thou
might submit to it, till it sl
the authority of the legislatu
but two orders of churchm
viz: bishops and deacons; a
bishops and priests were but
grees of the same order. — 4
hand of fellowship to foreign
ters that had not been ordai
being no dispute about reor
any church preferment, till the
Elizabeth's reign. In all whi
modern churchmen have depa

Edward greatly excelled al
the founding of free school

court for his henchmen, that is, his majesty's pages and other youth attending on him. But especially this appeared by his founding so many schools in the nation; more by a great many than any of his predecessors had done. For, to compute only from the time that Bishop Goodrich had the great seal, in a little more than sixteen months, he founded at least sixteen free schools." These were all founded, as it appears, between December 5, 1551, and May 26, 1553, and were in addition to others founded by him in 1550–51, in Suffolk, Lincolnshire, Essex, Yorkshire, and Nottinghamshire. "These schools had governors appointed over them, and master and usher, and endowed commonly with 20*l.*, 30*l.*, or 40*l.* per annum. And, indeed, for the most part, the endowments were out of tithes formerly belonging to religious houses, or out of chantry lands given to the king in the first of his reign, according to the intent of parliament therein." * Thus it appears, that, though there was frightful waste of property during this young king's

* *Strype*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. pp. 50–, 278–; and Repository of Originals, bk. II. pp. 502–.

In the *Lords' Journal* we find numerous notices of bills introduced for the establishment of free schools in different parts of the kingdom. Several such appear as early as 2d Edward VI., 1547-48. Thus, on the 4th of March of that year, a bill was introduced for the erecting of a free school in the town of St. Albans, or elsewhere, by Richard Borman, clerk. On the 5th of the same month, a bill was introduced for the foundation of a school at Barkhampstede, in the county of Hereforde; and on the 8th a bill was read for the foundation of a school in Stamforde. See vol. I. p. 354, etc.

mation of faith and order,
and expressed opinions of th
evident, from all contemporai
had by no means perfected, i
the work of reforming the cl
fast and as far as they judge
to go. The people were, to
ignorant and superstitious, a
tious rites and ceremonies w
stroy religion itself; and not
break into open rebellion a
purify the church. It was i
of feeling that some of the
errors were suffered to remai
"to draw the people more e
mation." Other things were
Grindal and Bishop Horn t
should grant better times." J
Polander, superintendent of
which were allowed in Lond
reign, says: "King Edward

excited to embrace apostolical purity with the unanimous consent of the states of the kingdom."* Edward's "Discourse about the Reformation of Many Abuses," suggested by Bucer's book "Concerning the Kingdom of Christ," written at the king's request, in which the remaining errors and corruptions of the English church are pointed out, shows conclusively that some at least of the Reformers, and the king himself, would gladly have gone much further than they did in purifying the church.† Dr. Cox, the king's tutor, wrote to the learned Bullinger, of Zurich, in 1550, as follows: "I think all things in the church ought to be pure and simple, removed at the greatest distance from the pomps and elements of this world. But, in this our church, what can I do in so low a station? I can only endeavor to persuade our bishops to be of the same mind with myself. This I wish truly, and I commit to God the care and conduct of his own work." Mr. Neal tells us, on the authority of Bullinger, that Archbishop Cranmer was not satisfied with the liturgy, "though it had been twice reformed." ‡

From the above extracts it appears that some

* *Neal*, I. 121. See also Lasco's work on the Sacraments, prefatory epistle, in *Strype*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. pp. 33–36.

† *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. I. p. 324–; and Edward's Remains, in *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. No. 2. *Collier* gives a pretty full abstract of Bucer's discourse "Concerning the Kingdom of Christ." —Vol. V. pp. 397–408.

‡ *Neal*, I. 128; *Strype* and *Burnet*, *ut sup.*

ties, they did what they th
ing it in trust to those w
them to finish the work w
begun.*

* It is hardly necessary to say th
controverted by some able and le
bury, for example, says: "Many
our own church, have alleged, tho
dence, that our Reformers intended
certain things which we retain. T
time, and some moderate men who
doubtedly wished to proceed furth
selves understood their work, which
and they stopped at that point at wh
would be accomplished. That some
ormation were anxious to go further
themselves ever entertained such a
Pp. 120, 121. The only answer wh
require is a reference to the quoted
Grindal, Horn, and others, as given
pages.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE REIGN OF MARY, 1553–1558. — THE RESTORATION OF POPERY.

THE reign of Mary Tudor can never be contemplated by a protestant without loathing, nor by an honest papist without shame. It is "all over mean and black." It is smeared with human blood. It has no redeeming feature. Still the record must stand on the pages of English history as an illustration of despotic, unrestrained Romanism, as a beacon-light to subsequent generations.

The English crown was settled on Mary by the will of her father and the act of parliament (35 Henry VIII.), in the event of Edward's death without issue. For, though Mary and Elizabeth had both, in turn, been declared illegitimate by Henry and his obedient parliaments, and their titles to the throne set aside, yet, in perfect consistency with their unparalleled inconsistency, Henry and his parliament finally recognized the titles of both sisters to the crown. Mary, therefore, as the elder sister, had an undoubted right to Edward's vacant throne. But the apprehended consequences of the reign of a bitter and exasperated papist, such as Mary was known to be, had been used by the

ter-in-law of the duke, th
plished Lady Jane Grey, wh
of Suffolk, stood next to H
the line of succession estat
parliament. Edward's act,
ifestly illegal, that some c
even, refused to countenan
saw the disastrous consequ
Among these objectors wer
the very head and life of
Judge Hales, "a most steac
the Reformation," * who, F
life for queen Mary's caus
subscribe to the uninheritir
will." †

On the death of the king,
umberland was to conceal
get possession of Mary anc
messages had been sent to c
sick brother. Mary was a
day's journey of London w

death of her brother and the purposes of Northumberland. She immediately retired into Norfolk, and took refuge in the castle of Framlingham, near the sea, that she might escape to her cousin, Charles V. of Spain, if unsuccessful in her attempts to obtain the throne. Finding his secret was betrayed, and that Mary was on her guard, Northumberland and his party immediately (July 10th) proclaimed the Lady Jane Grey queen of England, she being a passive, unwilling instrument in the hands of her ambitious kindred. The proclamation was rather coolly received by the people; for, though Lady Jane was everything that could be asked for in a young queen, her father-in-law, on whom it was foreseen the management of affairs would chiefly devolve, was extremely unpopular. Mary in the mean time had gathered around her a strong body of friends and supporters, including a considerable number of the zealous friends of the Reformation, and asserted resolutely her claim to the throne. Northumberland feeling obliged to march at the head of the government troops to oppose Mary's gathering forces, the council turned traitors to his interests, and on the 19th of July proclaimed Mary. Thus, almost without a struggle, the crown fell to its lawful possessor; and on the 3d of August, Mary entered London in triumph, the recognized sovereign of the kingdom.

Once in full possession of the throne, Mary began to shape her course with reference to the overthrow

queen's course in this fatal
ular notice. Soon after
lingham castle, and when
of friends and supporters,
men, who, we are told, we
tion, gathered around her a
would allow the protestant
molested if she succeeded
She gave them the most
she would make no innova
tablished during Edward's
self with the private exerci
Assured on this fundamen
gentry, and the commons
ately rallied around the
placed her on the throne.*

Her second step was tak
gust, nine days after her trit
don. She then made an op
cil, that, "although her ow
in the matters of religion, v

done by the opening his word to them, by godly, virtuous, and learned preachers." Here we perceive that the *queen* Mary begins to modify, somewhat, the promise of the *lady* Mary. She has now concluded not to content herself with the private exercise of her own religion, but to employ "godly, virtuous, and learned preachers," to persuade her people that hers is the only true faith.

Nine days' further reflection and preparation brought the queen another step downward. On the 18th of August, an inhibition in the queen's name was put forth, declaring herself of "that religion she had professed from her infancy, and that she would maintain it during her time, and be glad that all her subjects would charitably receive it. Yet, she did not compel any of her subjects to it *till public order should be taken on it* by common consent." Then, as a further aid towards a charitable reception of her religion, she "straightly charges" her subjects, "that none should preach, or expound scripture, or print any books or plays without her special license." * So, then, it seemed, the queen's notion of being "content with the private exercise of her own religion" included not only proselyting her subjects by means of "godly, virtuous, and learned preachers" of Romanism, but also the absolute prohibition of all other preaching in the kingdom, and the stopping of every protes-

* *Burnet, ut sup.* p. 490; *Collier*, VI. 12. *Fox*, III. 14, contains this "Inhibition."

tablished religion of the ki
ery to its ancient strongho
of this inhibition, some o
had been so serviceable to
her extremity, ventured in
reminder of her promise to
fication of her course wh
them was, first, a reprimanc
and to one of their leaders
for three days in the pillory,
by reminding her of her
sent to prison for their presu
a continuance of the protes

The queen is now so firm
and her plans so fully mat
tence and concealment are
sary; and the measures of
forward with the utmost a
15th and 18th of August,
of protestants, under vario
rested and imprisoned;

license such as he thought meet to preach God's word." * Many of the Reformers, nevertheless, continued their ministerial labors, some preaching openly, and others in a more private way instructing and directing their people. Before the close of the month, Bishop Coverdale of Exeter and Bishop Hooper of Worcester were summoned before the council; and on the first of September Hooper was sent to the Fleet prison, and Coverdale placed under restraint. Images were set up in various places, and the Latin service was used by individuals, though expressly against the unrepealed laws of the kingdom.

Cranmer's friends urged him to flee from the impending storm; but, while he advised others to do this, he refused to leave his post; and on the 8th of September received his first summons before the council. On the 12th he was called again, and on the next day was sent to the Tower, together with old Latimer. About the same time, the French protestants who resided in London had orders to leave the kingdom; and John a Lasco, the superintendent of the foreign churches in London, was first silenced and then sent out of the country, as were the other foreign protestant preachers. In company with these foreigners, and in other ways, great numbers of English protestants — eight or ten hundred, it is said — escaped from the kingdom. But Mary had no intention of losing her

* *Fox*, III. 12–15; *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. II. pp. 493–96.

ers, bishops and divines, who ...
yond the sea, were now in pri
most cunning and capable pries
his day, was at the head of t
lord chancellor; and all thing
ready for the coronation of the
first parliamentary assembly o
was crowned on the 1st of O
and half a score of Romish
mitres, copes, and crosiers, and
pomp and ceremony thought l
sion.

Mary's first parliament met
ber, 1553, and continued in se
ment of three days intervenin
6th.* The acts of this parliar
have special concern were, firs
lawfulness of Henry's marriag

* *Statutes of the Realm*, 1 Mary, vol. r
289, Lond. 1762. *Fox* (III. 15) says this
misled probably by the continuation o

Aragon and the legitimacy of Mary, (and, by necessary inference, the illegitimacy of Elizabeth,) and repealing all acts of parliament and sentences of divorce had and made to the contrary. Second, an act repealing all the laws about religion made during the reign of Edward VI., and enacting, that, after the 20th of December, 1553, "no other kind nor order of divine service, nor administration of sacrament, be used or ministred within the said realm of England than was most commonly used, ministred, and frequented in the said last year of the reign of the said late king Henry VIII." Third, an act to punish all who should disturb, molest, or disquiet any preacher or priest of the old religion, or should break altars, crucifixes, and crosses. Fourth, an act making it felony for twelve or more persons to meet together to alter anything established by law relating to religion. This last act made plain and easy the work of punishing the little congregations of dissenters who might meet in private for religious worship.*

A convocation of the clergy, as usual, accompanied this parliament. Harpsfield, Bonner's chaplain, preached the *concio ad clerum* on the occasion. In his sermon he praises the queen *ad nauseam:* comparing her to Judith, who cut off the head of Holophernes; to Esther the queen; to Deborah, a mother in Israel; to Mary, who had chosen the

* The several acts referred to in this paragraph may be found in *Statutes*, 1 Mary, session 2d, chaps. 1, 2, 3, and 12.

good part; and finally, to the virgin Mary, whom all nations called blessed.*

While these important acts were in progress through the parliament and convocation, other agents were busy, preparing for the tragic scenes which were soon to be enacted in the kingdom. On the 3d of October, Archbishop Cranmer, with Lord Dudley, and Lady Jane Grey, his wife, were brought to their trial, and condemned as traitors; though Cranmer plead the unwilling part which he acted in the matter of the succession. On the 4th, the archbishop of York was sent to the Tower. Thus the church was stripped of both her archbishops, as well as of nearly all her bishops.†

As early as the first of November, "the Spanish match" had begun to be agitated. Mary, to be sure, was thirty-seven years old, and far from personally attractive; ‡ and Philip, the eldest son of Charles V., was but twenty-nine, and by no means enamored of the English queen; but then, her kingdom was a prize worth making a sacrifice for. England united to Spain! What a splendid kingdom! What wealth and political influence would flow from such a union! The trade of the world would be at its disposal; and its voice would be paramount among all the kingdoms of Europe! These were visions too flattering to the ambition

* *Strype*, vol. III. pt. I. ch. IV. p. 60–65.

† *Burnet, ut sup.* p. 425; *Fox*, III. 24.

‡ *Fuller* says Mary had "her father's feature, a face broad and big, with her mother's color, a somewhat swarthy complexion."

of Charles V. and his haughty son Philip to be lightly regarded; and, if we may believe the historian of the Reformation, both father and son were ready to lavish Spanish gold without stint, to pave the way to the English throne.

But, unfortunately for the wishes of Charles and Philip, the English nation did not take the same view of this match as the Spaniards did. When the matter became known in London, the commons were so much disturbed and alarmed, that they came to a resolution to address the queen against the match; and sent their speaker, with some twenty of their number, to her with a humble and very earnest petition that she would not marry a stranger. What the queen said in reply we do not know; but what she did is on record: she immediately dissolved the parliament, trusting to the means which princes then knew how to use, to secure more pliant materials through another election. Probably another reason for this dissolution of parliament was "the disinclination of the members for restoring the papal supremacy," on which step her majesty was resolved.*

While these things were transpiring in public, a messenger from the pope's legate in Spain found his way clandestinely into the private closet of the queen, and obtained the solemn assurance of her purpose to reconcile the kingdom to the see of

* *Parl. Hist.*, III. 299–301; *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. II. pp. 524–26, 536–38; *Collier*, VI. 29.

Rome just so soon as she dared; for she assured him that it must be managed with great prudence and secrecy. Having obtained a letter from the queen to the pope, expressing her filial obedience, and another to Cardinal Pole, and receiving the injunction of the queen that he should move the pope to send Pole as papal legate to England, the crafty priest returned to Rome, and set the city in an uproar of rejoicing for three days over the good news from England. Cardinal Pole was soon on his way to England, with full legatine powers to reconcile the kingdom to the papal dominion. The knowledge of these movements reaching the ear of Gardiner, he was at once alarmed lest his well-laid plans should be defeated by the premature development of the queen's purposes; and immediately applied to the emperor to stop Pole on his journey; and finally persuaded Mary to request the legate to delay his appearance in England until the way was more fully prepared.

In January, 1553-54, occurred the unsuccessful rebellion, under the leadership of the Duke of Suffolk, Sir Thomas Wyat, Sir Peter Carew, and others. The Spanish match was the chief topic employed to stir up this rebellion. The people were told, that, if Philip married Mary, England would become a mere province of Spain, and be governed with all the tyranny which marked the Spanish rule in the Netherlands, in Milan, Naples, Sicily, and the West Indies; and, to crown all, that the Inquisition would be introduced. To over-

throw Mary's government, and to save the nation from the rule of popery, were undoubtedly the great ends of this rebellion. Its partial success, under circumstances extremely unfavorable, proves that the spirit of discontent was deep and widespread in the nation. The premature discovery of the plans of the conspirators, however, deranged and defeated the whole plot, and brought the rebellion to a speedy and ignominious end; and more than all, furnished a pretence for beginning the bloody work for which this reign of Mary will be forever infamous.

On the 12th of February, Lord Dudley and the innocent Lady Jane Grey were brought to the scaffold for the sin of her father. The Duke of Suffolk followed her on the 21st of the same month; Wyat's execution succeeded the duke's; and more than fifty others paid the penalty of their lives for being engaged in this rebellion, while some hundreds of others escaped only with halters about their necks.

An unsuccessful attempt was made to compromise the lady Elizabeth, and the Earl of Devonshire, who was understood to be a suitor for Elizabeth's hand. They were both thrown into prison, and others were brought into danger for the same cause.*

* *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. II. pp. 538–48; *Collier*, VI. 50–62.

Lingard says that about *sixty* persons were executed for participating in Wyat's rebellion. And while he apologizes as well as he can for the execution of the Lady Jane Grey, he yet says: "It

On the 4th of March, 1553-54, feeling h
now secure on the throne, Mary issued a seri
eighteen articles, addressed to the bishops, r
ing the immediate execution of all such c
and ecclesiastical laws as were in use durin
reign of Henry VIII., which were not directl
expressly contrary to the existing laws of the r
forbidding them to proceed in their courts
longer in the queen's name; commanding th
ecclesiastical person should be required to tal
oath of supremacy or succession as heretofor
ministered; that the bishops and their officers
a vigilant eye and use special diligence and
sight that no person be admitted to any eccl
tical function, benefit, or office, being a sacra
tary, infected or defamed of any notable kin
heresy or other great crime; and that they d
gently travail for the suppressing of heresies
notable crimes, especially in the clergy, du
pressing and punishing the same; and that
do likewise condemn and repress corrup

would, perhaps, have been to the honor of Mary, if she ha
looked the provocation, and refused to visit on the daugh
guilt of the father" — *Hist. Eng.*, vol. VII. ch. II. pp. 221–2
however, charges Elizabeth with being privy to this con

naughty opinions, unlawful books, ballads, and other pernicious and hurtful devices. All married clergymen and other ecclesiastical persons were to be proceeded against summarily, and with all speed, depriving them of their livings, and sequestering the fruits and profits of their benefices, and also requiring them to be divorced at once from their "women"; and it was commanded that all manner of processions, after the old order of the church, in the Latin tongue, be used, frequented, and continued; also, that the laudable and honest ceremonies which were wont to be used in the church be restored; together with such holy-days and fasting-days as were observed in the late time of King Henry VIII. It was further required, that a uniform doctrine be set forward by homilies, and that the parishioners be compelled to come to their several churches; that all schoolmasters and teachers of youth not friendly to popery be removed, and catholic men be placed in their room, "with a special commandment, to instruct their children so as they may be able to answer the priest at the mass, and so help the priest to mass, as hath been accustomed."*

Another royal act, of the same general character as the above, was the issuing of a commission, dated March 15th, 1553-4, to six bishops, with Gardiner at their head, authorizing any two of them to call before them, try, deprive, and punish the

* *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. II. p. 549, and Records, No. 10.

lord, for preaching erroneous &c.
ordinate life and conversation.
were at once made vacant in t
manner. But Gardiner, with t
tion of the pontiff, consecrated
supersede these deposed Refor
mediately supplied their places.*

* *Burnet, ut sup.* pp. 549–54; *Lingard,*
67. *Strype,* in his *Memorials,* tells us, t
1554, "it was thought convenient to re
bishops and clergy"; and that all of
were "clapped up" on some pretence or
the Fleet, the Marshalsea, the King's
two Counters were full of them." — Vol.

The prisoners in the King's Bench an
at least, seem to have been kindly treat
liberty and enjoyment which their situa
of holding religious meetings among t
ing to the friendliness of the keepers,
shal, Sir William Fitz-William. The pri
who kindly furnished funds for their
these Christian men and women were
but *Strype* has preserved a list of some
have been large contributors to this da

Mary's second parliament was convened April 2d, 1554, but remained in session only to May 5th. The business of this parliament, according to the chancellor's introductory speech, was chiefly "for corroboration of true religion, and concerning the queen's highness' most noble marriage."* The first act of this parliament declares that the regal power of the realm is in the queen's majesty as fully and absolutely as it was in any of the kings of the realm. The second act is entitled, "An Act touching the articles of the queen's highness' most noble marriage." It was introduced on the 7th of April, and driven along with such rapidity, that, important as it was, it passed its several stages and was ready for the royal assent on the 12th of the same month — five days only, and one of them the Sabbath, having intervened between the first presentation of the bill to the house of lords, and its complete enactment and return to their lordships by the commons.†

The 16th, 17th, and 18th of April, 1554, are memorable in the history of Mary's reign, as the days on which the venerable and amiable Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Ridley, and "Old Latimer" were baited and abused at Oxford, under pretence of debating the sacramental question. They were ordered to appear, each his day, before the gathered champions of popery, to dispute on the subject named. No conference with each other was

* *Parl. Hist.*, III. 303–5; *Statutes*, 1 Mary, 3d session.
† *Statutes*, chaps. 1 and 2, *ut sup.*; *Parl. Hist.*, III. 302

men, but were treated like wild beasts. W
"known to be a constant drunkard," * was th
locutor and presiding officer of the tumultuo
sembly. He railed on Cranmer, calling hir
unlearned, unskilful, and impudent man"
Weston's associates, taking their cue from
often hissed down the archbishop, drownir
voice so that he could not be heard at all. F
when it came his day to dispute, begged tl
might not be interrupted while speaking, ar
promise was made to him; but it was broke
the bishop was hooted down very much as
mer had been. Ridley, in his account c
scene, says: "There was great disorder, per
shoutings, tauntings, and reproaches, so t
looked like a stage [rather] than a school
vines." Four or five were speaking at once.
was called a disputation, by the papists; ar
prolocutor declared the Reformers vanquishe
less than *fourteen* learned papists were
against this one bold protestant; yet all

On the 20th of July, Philip arrived at Southampton, was received with great pomp, and conducted on to Winchester, where he was met by the enamored queen. He was married by Gardiner on the 25th. Two days after, they were proclaimed by the following sounding titles: "Philip and Mary, King and Queen of England, France, Naples, Jerusalem, and Ireland; Princes of Spain and Sicily, Defenders of the Faith; Archdukes of Austria; Dukes of Milan, Burgundy, and Brabant; Counts of Habspring, Flanders, and Tirol"! With such triumphing did this bridal pair enter upon their new life. The selfish ambition of the stately bridegroom was gratified by the addition of new and valuable titles to his long list of hereditary honors, and the foolish bride had the desire of her heart in the possession of a royal, catholic husband; and now the world was to see, on a regal scale, one of the three things for which the earth is disquieted —"an odious woman when she is married." Philip brought a large amount of treasure into the country, but not enough to buy the affections, or even the moderate good-will of the English;* and he probably derived as little pleasure from his new connection as he imparted. It was an unhappy affair in all its aspects.*

* "The 12th of February, [1554-5,] ninety-nine horses and two carries laden with treasure of gold and silver, brought out of Spain, was conveyed through the citie to the Tower of London, under the conduct of Sir Thomas Gersham, the queen's merchant and other." — *Stowe's Chronicle.*

Whenever he found matters n
railed and swore at the priest a
even employed personal violer
meaning. In his attempt to
parson of Hadham, he missec
blow fell with great force on Si
ear. One of the bishop's atte
for Bonner, by saying that his b
Marshalsea prison had disorde
did not know in his passior
Thomas replied, that he thoug
out of the Marshalsea he shoul
lam. The carvers and makers
abundant employment, roods
being ordered up all over the
for it was Bonner's anxious ca
idolatrous order of things in
and as fast as possible.*

This visitation of the count
for the third and the most imp
this reign: the one that was t

to the Romish church, revive the old persecuting statutes of the realm, and introduce the scenes of blood which have marked with an everlasting stigma this popish queen, as "The Bloody Mary!" In the writs which summoned this parliament, the title of "Supreme Head of the Church of England" was, for the first time since Henry assumed it, dropped. The session commenced November 12th, 1554, and continued to January 16th, 1554-5.* Especial care had been taken by the court to secure the election of persons friendly to popery. The queen went so far as to address a circular letter to the sheriffs, in which she commanded them to use their influence to prevent any but "grave and catholic sort" being returned to parliament.† The great body of the commons, on assembling, were found to be of the right sort; and the especial work of the session was pushed on rapidly, and satisfactorily to the court; though thirty-nine members, finding the majority determined to sacrifice everything on the altar of popery, on the 12th of January withdrew wholly from parliament, of whom "the great lawyer Plowden was one." ‡

The first important act of the session was the

* *Statutes* of Philip and Mary, *anno* 1 and 2.

† *Parl. Hist.*, III. 311; *Strype*, vol. III. pt. I. ch. 19, pp. 244–46.

‡ The names of these bold men, who were afterwards indicted in the queen's bench for their boldness, are given by Lord Coke, in his *Institutes*, pt. IV. p. 13; by *Strype*, *ut sup.* ch. 20, p. 262; and by the authors of the *Parl. Hist.*, III. 333.

repeal of the bill of attainder against Cardinal Pole.* Two days after, the cardinal arrived in London; and on the 27th of November a message was sent to both houses, to come to Whitehall and hear the legate's message to the rebellious, but now repenting kingdom. He made the members a long speech, setting forth his legatine authority from the pope, and inviting them to return and be reconciled to his holiness, the sovereign pontiff. Two days after, the parliament, in a humble petition to the king and queen, to intercede with the pope for the reconciliation of the kingdom to the see of Rome, confessed their sin for what had been done against his holiness, and humbly begged on their knees, forgiveness, and the restoration of his favor. The legate was only too happy to receive this confession, and to grant this prayer; and so England, after twenty years of alienation from mother church, was absolved and restored to her loving arms forthwith, to the unutterable joy of the pope and his conclave at Rome.

This great work accomplished, the ministry now

* So the *Parliamentary History* says: "The first bill that appeared in the lords was to repeal the act of attainder against Cardinal Pole." It was introduced on the 17th of November, passed both houses on the 21st, and had the royal assent on the 22d, the king and queen being both present on this occasion. — Vol. III. p. 813, or vol. I. p. 617, of Hansard's edition. The printed *Statutes of the Realm* do not contain this act; though it is in the list of acts of that parliament, and numbered 18. The printed collection contains only 17. See Public Records, *Statutes of the Realm*, pt. I. vol. IV. p. 237, comp. p. 264.

drove on the work arranged for this parliament. First came the repeal of "all statutes, articles, and provisions, made against the see apostolique of Rome, since the twentieth year of King Henry VIII." The title of "Supreme Head of the Church" was erased from the royal titles; it was declared that bulls from Rome might be executed, and the statutes of mortmain were repealed; in short, that the whole fabric of law by which the Reformation had been established and sustained in England should be at once and forever overthrown. There was only one topic on which the voice of parliament was not in accordance with the queen's and the pope's wishes, and that was the church lands which had been alienated to the laity. It was found necessary to make a proviso in the statute of general repeal, "for the establishment of all spiritual and ecclesiastical possessions and hereditaments conveyed to the laity." Without this, it was thought the pope's supremacy could not have been restored.*

By another bill, the persecuting statutes of Richard II., Henry IV., and Henry V., against the Lollards, were restored to their full force again.† A bill was passed making it treason, punishable with death, to pray "that God would turn the queen's

* *Statutes*, 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, ch. 8. This act is very minute in its provisions, containing twenty-six sections, and filling eight and a half folio pages. *Parl. Hist.*, pp. 824–28; *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. pp. 589–98.

† *Statutes, ut sup.* ch. 6.

heart from idolatry to the true faith, or else shorten her days and take her quietly out of the way." And still another instrument of persecution was framed, in an act entitled, "An Act for the punishment of seditious words and rumors." Justices of the peace were authorized to take cognizance of all such seditious words, and to punish the offenders by the pillory, a heavy fine, by cutting off the ears, and by imprisonment; and if the offence was committed by books, rhyme, ballad, or letter, the offender was to have his right hand cut off.*

The appointed work of this third parliament of Mary's reign being now finished, on the 15th of January, 1554-5, a grand procession was made through the city by the members of both houses, accompanied by the lord mayor of London, with the aldermen, and the several companies in livery. This procession was made as imposing as possible. "Ninety crosses, one hundred and sixteen priests and clerks, each attired in his cope, and after them eight bishops in their *pontificalibus*, followed by Bonner, bishop of London, carrying the pyx under a canopy," were among its adornments. The procession was a thank-offering for the conversion of the kingdom to popery; and was terminated by mass in St. Paul's. The next day parliament was dissolved.†

* *Parl. Hist.*, III. 330, 331; *Statutes*, ch. 8.

† *Parl. Hist.*, III. 332, 333; *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. p. 602; *Fox*, III. 96.

CHAPTER IX.

MARTYRDOM OF THE PROTESTANTS. — MARY'S DEATH AND CHARACTER.

For nearly eighteen months the queen and her councillors and obedient parliaments had been carefully preparing the tragedy which is now to be put upon the stage. During nearly all these months, numbers of learned and excellent men, including the highest dignitaries of the church, the most devoted bishops and faithful clergy, had been pining in the common prisons, among felons and murderers, not only deprived of their livings, but stripped even of their little personal property, and made dependent in a great measure on the charity of friends, who ministered to them at the hazard of their own liberty and lives. And all this time the martyrs were refused a judicial trial; their prayers for a hearing were disregarded, and they were treated like the worst of malefactors; and all because they had embraced and preached the doctrines which the Scriptures had taught them, and practised the rites and ceremonies which the laws of the land had established.

But their time of deliverance was at hand. Immediately after the adjournment of parliament, the

not improbable that the fact that he had a wif
ten children dependent on him may have bee
principal reason. To have had this in mind v
have been like Gardiner, the craftiest of men.
theory was, that the Reformers would not bu
their religion; and that the true policy of the
ernment was to adopt, not the mild course
cated by Pole, but a sharp and vigorous pro
tion. This he fancied would bring the leade
once to terms; and then the commonalty, h
gued, would readily follow them back to the c
of Rome. Rogers was a leading spirit in Lo
and though a man of known firmness and dec
Gardiner may have shrewdly anticipated th
wife and ten helpless children would be ju
many irresistible arguments against his l
down his life in defence of his faith. But in
as in many other things, the cunning chan
found himself mistaken. He urged Rogers t
knowledge the pope's supremacy, and threa
him if he refused. But his arguments an

was let off on a simple promise to be an "honest man."

On the 28th of January, Bishop Hooper, another strong man, was called before the bishops of Winchester, London, Durham, Salisbury, Norwich, and Carlisle, with certain of the council, sitting as an ecclesiastical commission to try heretics. The bishop refused submission. Rogers was also called before this tribunal the same day, and still refused to deny his faith. One night was given them both for further reflection. Being found still firm in their purpose to die rather than deny their Lord, they were both condemned as obstinate heretics, and given into the sheriff's hands for execution, after being degraded from their ecclesiastical character, according to papal law. On the same day, Taylor and Bradford were brought before this commission, though their examination was deferred until the 30th; when they, with Crome and Sanders, and Ferrar, bishop of St. David's, were arraigned, and Taylor, Bradford, and Sanders were condemned as obstinate heretics, excommunicated, and given up to the flames. The other two were respited for a while.

On the 4th of February, 1554-5, the fires of Smithfield, which were destined to continue burning, almost without cessation, while this wicked queen lived, were lighted to consume the first Christian martyr of this popish reign. Early in the morning, John Rogers was wakened from a deep sleep, and required to prepare for the flames.

Psalm. A pardon was offered to him befor
flames were kindled; but he refused, preferri
lose his life rather than his soul; and with
words to the people, in which he exhorted the
continue in the doctrine which he had taught
he washed his hands in the flame, and chee
gave up his life a sacrifice to the truth.

Four days after this, on February 8th, Sa
whom Collier calls "a Wickliffite," * was b
at Coventry; and the next day Bishop H
was roasted with green wood for three quarte
an hour before life was extinct, at Glouces
his old bishopric. He was refused the privile
addressing his beloved people before his
On the same day, Taylor was burned at H
after being subjected to most brutal treatme
the stake.†

* *Ch. Hist.*, VI. 106.

† For the particulars of the trials of these learned an
men, and their patient sufferings and triumphant deat
reader should consult *Fox's Acts and Monuments*, vol. I

The reign of terror was now fairly inaugurated. Gardiner had made full trial of his scheme of intimidation; but how had it worked? Four of the leading spirits among the Reformers had gone cheerfully, and joyfully even, to the stake, refusing proffered pardons, and sealing their faith with their blood before admiring and sympathizing thousands. Thus, instead of being intimidated by the fire, and renouncing their faith, as Gardiner predicted, their faith had carried them triumphantly to their end. And the people generally who had embraced the Reformation, instead of being frightened by the severities inflicted on their leaders, were greatly strengthened in their belief of the gospel; and were ready to offer themselves as sacrifices to the same good cause. No less than six new arrests of protestants were made on the very day of Sanders' death; and on the next day, while Hooper was burning, were examined by Bonner, and, refusing to recant, were condemned as obstinate heretics, and five of them soon after burned.

After these condemnations, Fox says: "Steven Gardiner, seeing thus his advice disappointed, and that cruelty in this case would not serve to his expectation, gave over the matter as utterly discouraged, and from that day [February 9th, 1554-5] meddled no more in such kind of condemnations, but referred the whole doing thereof to Bonner,

threatening to cut out their tongues at once if they would not thus promise. — Vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. p. 610.

bishop of London."* Whether this was the reason why Gardiner meddled no more wit bloody work, or whether his duties as lord cha lor and chief manager of the affairs of the dom engrossed his time, or he was annoyed reminded, as he had been most pointedly by brave old martyrs, and might be by other his former labors and writings against the p supremacy; or wished to avoid the odium v soon attached to all the active agents in cruel persecution — whether some of these co erations may not have had quite as much t with Gardiner's course as that which Fox ass the reader must judge. Be this as it may, a share of the guilt of this terrible persecutio taches to Gardiner; for Pole was averse to vi measures, and even Philip sought to screen self.

The people ascribed the persecution main Philip, who had been bred in the land of th quisition. But his confessor, Alphonse, took publicly to announce his conviction, that the bu of men for religion was not consistent with the t ings of Scripture; evidently to clear Philip of odium. Perhaps he belied his master's sentin and his own; nevertheless, his purpose is pl

* *Acts and Mons.*, III. 149. *Burnet* makes the same repr tion. — *Ut sup.* p. 609.

† *Fox*, III. 149; *Burnet*, *ut sup.* 612. This friar, Alphon Castro, and another Spanish friar, had a conference with ford, the martyr. when in prison, February 20th, 1554-5. Al

The guilt was then attributed to the bishops. But Gardiner on one occasion clearly intimated that there was a power behind them, which drove them on. The bishops after a while left this work mainly to Bonner; but even he, bad as he was, complained that he had to do the work and bear the stigma which belonged to others; and he took pains to leave on record the letters of the council, stirring him up and setting him on the scent for blood. All the great agents in the Marian persecution, then, except the queen herself, seem to have sought to screen themselves from the terrible odium of burning so many innocent and good men and women. And though they were all guilty of innocent blood, and Gardiner, as prime minister of the kingdom, the early advocate of violent proceedings, and at least the tacit consenter to their continuance, must be held specially accountable, yet there can be no

was introduced to Bradford as the person who had written a book in Latin against heresies. — *Fox*, III. 248. This book seems to have been put into Bradford's hands and read by him; and when the martyr was told of Alphonse's sermon against persecution, he replied: "Verily, I had a book within these two days, of his writing, and therein he saith that it is not meet nor convenient that the heretics should live." — *Fox*, III. 253.

According to the *Biographie Universelle*, this monk was one of the most celebrated Spanish preachers and theologians of the sixteenth century, of the order of St. François à Salamanque, and died at Brussels in 1558, at the age of sixty-three. The most important work of his is entitled *Adversus Omnes Hæreses*, in fourteen books. He also published *De Juste Hæreticorum Puritione*, in three books; and *De Potestate Legis Penalis*, in two books. He was honored with the title "Hæresio-mastix acerrimus, scriptorumque felicissimus."

doubt but that Mary was the mainspring of the persecution.

From the 9th of February to the 16th of March, 1554-5, there was a cessation of burnings. Gardiner's withdrawal, and Alphonse's sermon against burning people, may have occasioned this. But on the 16th of March the fires of Smithfield were again lighted, to consume the body of a pious but unlearned man, Thomas Tompkins, a weaver. Bonner had kept him a prisoner for about six months, during which time he had exhausted his persuasive and abusive powers on the poor sufferer. He had coaxed him to renounce his faith, but in vain; he had then beaten him and burned him, with the same result; and finally had doomed him a whole burnt-offering. After this followed a quick succession of martyrdoms in different parts of the kingdom. Before the close of the month, Canston and Highbed, two gentlemen of good estate, were burned near their own houses, in Essex; others were burned at Brentwood, Braintree, Malden, and Colchester.

But all this infernal activity of her servants did not satisfy the queen; for, on the 26th of March, 1555, their majesties sent forth an order to the justices of the peace in Norfolk, requiring them to "lay special weight upon those which be teachers and preachers of heresy, or procurers of secret meetings for that purpose"; and "to have in every parish or part of the shire, as near as may be, some one or more honest men, secretly instructed

to give information of the behaviour of the inhabitants amongst and about them." *

On the 30th of March, Bishop Ferrar, of St. David's, after being condemned by his popish successor, Morgan, who acted as his judge, was burned at Caermarthen, Wales. And about the same time a poor old Welsh fisherman, named Rawlins White, was burned at Cardiff for sending his son to school that he might learn to read the Bible to him, and for heresy.

Though during the month of April there were several arrests of "heretics," we have but two martyrdoms to record: John Awcock died in prison, and was buried in the fields, being denied Christian burial; and a priest named George Marsh was burnt at Chester, under circumstances of special cruelty. A firkin of pitch was fastened above his head, which melted and ran down upon him, scalding him with every drop.

About this time, Bonner, getting weary of his bloody work, refused to try any who did not belong to his diocese; and for five weeks burnt none. But on the 24th of May he received a letter from their "Christian majesties," Philip and Mary, setting him on afresh after his prey; † and he began to send his victims by pairs to the stake. On the 30th of May, a priest and a mechanic were burned at Smithfield. About the 9th of June, a weaver

* *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. p. 624, and Records, No. 19.

† See the letter of the king and queen in *Burnet's* Collections, vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. No. 20.

was burnt at Colchester; on the 10th, two husbandmen were sent down from London to Essex, to be burnt; a gentleman was burnt at Coxhall, Essex; and a linen-draper at Chelmsford. On the 15th, two more mechanics suffered, one at Manning-Tree, the other at Harwich. On the 25th of June, two priests and two laymen were burnt at Canterbury. During July the fires of martyrdom were kept briskly burning in different parts of the kingdom. In Tunbridge the first woman-martyr of this reign suffered at this time. Her name was Margaret Polley. A man was burnt at Darford, another at Lewes, another at Stoning, and another at Chichester, during the month.

In July, also, that devout and most excellent man, and almost Congregationalist martyr, John Bradford, was sent off to heaven in his chariot of fire, from Smithfield. Fox's account of this good man's last days is one of the most beautiful and touching memorials which the great martyrologist has left on record. Bradford seems to have early intended to devote himself to the law; but becoming particularly interested in religious matters while a resident in the Temple, he threw up the law and all his worldly prospects, and retired to Cambridge for further study; was admitted to the degree of M. A. after a year's residence, and was elected fellow of Pembroke Hall. Bucer became deeply interested in this devout and earnest student, and endeavored to persuade him to take license, but could not overcome his diffidence. At length Ridley

called him to be a deacon, gave him a license to preach, and made him a prebend of St. Paul's. There he distinguished himself during the last years of Edward's reign, by his devoted and successful labors. On the 13th of August, just after Mary's reign began, there was a terrible tumult raised in St. Paul's by the preaching of a violent popish sermon by one "master Bourne, then bishop of Bath." The preacher became so alarmed that he called on Bradford, whose influence with the people was very great, to interpose for his protection. This the good man readily did, and succeeded at once in quieting the rioters, and rescuing Bourne from his perilous situation. His success in this kindly undertaking, instead of securing the gratitude of the papists, involved Bradford in life-long trouble. The government argued, that the ease with which Bradford stilled the London mob proved that he must have been privy to the riot, and a leader of the rioters. He was therefore at once arrested and cast into prison, and was kept a prisoner, being shifted from prison to prison, until July, 1555, nearly two years.* He bore his confinement very patiently, and so demeaned himself in prison as to secure the confidence of all about him. His keeper allowed him to preach, and even administer the sacrament, within the prison-walls;

* Bradford had experience of nearly all the famous prison-houses in London. He was first sent to the Tower, then to the King's Bench, in Southwark, to the Clink, the Compter, and finally to Newgate.

and one of his keepers so trusted him, that, on his simple promise to return, he allowed him to go out and visit a sick friend in the city. The night before he was offered up to the Moloch of popery, he was taken from the Compter prison to Newgate; and on his departure, "when he was in the court, all the prisoners cried out to him, and bade him farewell, as the rest of the house had done before, with tears." And though it was near midnight when his transfer to Newgate was made, yet the streets were occupied with great numbers of people, who, hearing of the movement, had come out to see him; and "most gently bade him farewell, praying for him with most lamentable and pitiful tears," and so he went on to Newgate.

It was noised about that night, that Bradford was to be hurried out to execution by four o'clock the next morning, before the city was astir. At four o'clock, however, Smithfield was occupied by multitudes of both men and women, to take their last look of the beloved man, and see how a Christian could suffer. But they were compelled to wait until nine o'clock, when Bradford and a Christian apprentice named John Leaf, nineteen or twenty years of age, were brought to the stake. They first fell flat upon their faces on either side of the stake, and prayed long and fervently. When commanded by the sheriff to rise and make an end, Bradford took a fagot in his hand and kissed it, as he did likewise the stake; and having laid off his outer garment, and given it to his servant, a poor

man, to whom he had nothing else to give, he went to the stake, and then lifting his hands and countenance towards heaven exclaimed: "O England, England! repent thee of thy sins, repent thee of thy sins! Beware of idolatry! beware of false antichrists! take heed they do not deceive you!" Here the sheriff interfered and stopped him. The martyr then "asked all the world forgiveness, forgave all the world, and prayed the people to pray for him." Then turning to the young man who was to suffer with him, he said: "Be of good comfort, brother, for we shall have a merry supper with the Lord to-night." Then embracing the fagots, he said: "Straight is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." The fire was now kindled, and "thus like two lambs, they both ended their mortal lives, without any alteration of their countenance, being devoid of all fear, hoping to obtain the prize for which they had long run; to which may Almighty God happily conduct us, through the merits of Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour, Amen." *

* *Fox's* account of Bradford is particularly full and affectionate. — Vol. III. pp. 232–300; *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. pp. 628–30.

The Parker Society have published two volumes of the *Writings of Bradford* — 8vo. pp. xlviii. and 432, xii. and 592 — in which may be found nearly everything which remains to us of this learned, pious, gentle, yet brave man. His numerous conferences while in prison with distinguished papists prove not only their great anxiety to pervert him to their religion, but also the

There is not, perhaps, a martyr among all the hundreds who perished during this hateful reign whose name has come down to us more pure and fragrant than that of John Bradford. Meek and lowly in spirit, but utterly fearless in the discharge of duty, truthful and reliable, studious and devotional, generous and self-denying, kindly and sympathetic, he won the respect and love of all who knew him.

With this execution of Bradford and Leaf, Bonner ceased again, for a while, his bloody work. But other hands took it up, in different parts of the kingdom; and during the remainder of July, four were burnt in one fire, in Canterbury, and two at least perished in prison. In August, sixteen or eighteen victims were offered up at the shrine of popery, six in the same fire, at Canterbury. On the 6th of September, five victims were consumed in one fire at Canterbury; and seven others at different places perished during the month. On the 16th of October, perhaps the ablest man among the reformed bishops, Ridley, and the most devout and apostolic of their number, Latimer, perished at the same stake at Oxford.*

No important acts touching ecclesiastical affairs were passed by Mary's fourth parliament, which began its sessions October 21st, 1555, and closed

great ability of Bradford, and the uncommon suavity of his manners, as well as the devotion of his heart to God and his truth.

* *Fox*, III. 800–27; *Burnet, ut sup.* 637–42.

them December 9th following, except "An Act for the extinguishment of the first fruits, and touching the order and disposition of the tenths of spiritual and ecclesiastical promotions, and of rectories and parsonages impropriate, remaining in the queen's majesty's hands";* or, in plain English, an act whereby the crown resigned to the church all those profits from ecclesiastical sources which had been appropriated to its own use, by statute 26 of Henry VIII. chapter 3. This, however, was the smaller part of the queen's design. She wished to resign not only all the profits of ecclesiastical property at her disposal, but also to restore all church lands which had been alienated to the crown, and been sold or given to private persons. She took pains to sound some of her nobility on this subject, but "found such a general aversion to any kind of restitution in the lay-nobility, that she was advised to desist from that unprofitable undertaking." And Heylyn says: "Certain it is that many who were cordially affected to the queen's religion were very much startled at the noise of this restitution; insomuch that some of them are said to have clapped their hands upon their swords, affirming, not without some oaths, that they would never part with their abbey-lands as long as they were able to wear a sword by their sides."

On the 12th of November, 1555, Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, and chancellor of the

* *Statutes*, 2 and 3 Philip and Mary, chap. 4.

kingdom, passed to his dread account.* In his last sickness, conscience seems to have awakened within him a sense of sinfulness, and death overtook him while repeating to himself: "*Erravi cum Petro, et non flevi cum Petro!*" †

Near the close of November the fires of Canterbury were lighted again, and three persons were burnt at one stake; and during December some eighteen more protestant victims were slaughtered by the bishops, among whom was the learned and

* *Parl. Hist.*, vol. III. pp. 344, 345, or vol. I. p. 626 of Hansard's ed.; *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. p. 642.

† *Lingard* says: "During his last sickness he edified all around him by his piety and resignation, often observing, 'I have sinned with Peter, but with him I have not wept bitterly. — Negavi cum Petro, exivi cum Petro, sed nondum flevi amare cum Petro!'" — Vol. VII. p. 292.

One is tempted to inquire whether these oft-repeated words of the dying sinner do not rather imply the absence of the essential element of true piety — godly sorrow for sin. "I have denied my Lord with Peter; I have gone out from his presence with Peter; but as yet I have not wept bitterly over my sins with Peter!" This language suggests that his conscience was awakened — that he saw the sinful inconsistency of his life; and also the hope that at the very last he may have found peace where Peter did, and where the dying thief found it; but certainly does not afford a very edifying illustration of apostolic piety and resignation.

Fox is very bitter against Gardiner, III. 447–58. He says that Gardiner "neither was true protestant, nor right papist; neither constant in his error, nor yet steadfast in the truth; neither friend to the pope, and yet a perfect enemy to Christ; false in King Henry's time, a dissembler in King Edward's time, double perjured and a murderer in Queen Mary's time, mutable and inconstant in all times." *Strype* calls Gardiner "that implacable, bloody man." — Vol. III. pt. II. ch. 58, p. 61.

famous John Philpot, on the 18th of the month.* During January, 1555-6, the fires of persecution raged with great violence. The bishops, not content with burning men and women singly, or by pairs, now sent them in companies of four, five, seven, thirteen, and even sixteen, to the stake. On the 27th, five men and two women were burned at one stake in Smithfield. Among these seven martyrs was Thos. Whittle, a preacher, whom Bonner beat with his fist, and otherwise grievously abused; of whom Fox gives a most interesting account, particularly of his recantation and immediate horror of conscience, and speedy repentance. Another of these sufferers was Joan Lashford, *alias* Warne. She was the daughter of John and Elizabeth Warne, who were members of the protestant church which was surprised in Bowe churchyard, London. They were then seized, and subsequently burnt. And now the daughter, aged about twenty years, having been arrested while ministering to her imprisoned parents, and herself imprisoned for months, lays down her life.† On the 31st, one man and four women were consumed in the same fire at Canterbury. In March, besides tradesmen and women, the venerable Archbishop Cranmer was sent home through the flames, from Oxford. This occurred on the 21st of March, 1555-6, in the sixty-seventh year of his age. Every other

* *Fox*, III. 458; *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. pp. 658.
† *Fox*, III. 518–30.

day, on an average, during April, 1556, a burnt-offering was consumed; six in one fire at Smithfield, and the same number in another fire at Colchester. During May, the devil's work went briskly on; and from burning women and youth, the bishops went to burning the blind and the halt. A poor cripple, sixty-eight years old, and a blind man, were burnt together, by Bonner, at Stratford-le-Bow. They comforted themselves as the fire was kindling, that they should soon be freed of their infirmities. The cripple, casting away his crutch, cries to his blind associate: "Be of good comfort, my brother; for my lord of London is one good physician! He will heal us both shortly; thee of thy blindness, and me of my lameness!" Another blind man was burnt at Gloucester. Between twenty and thirty — I make twenty-two — perished in June; thirteen were burnt in one fire, at Stratford-le-Bow, by Bonner's command, two of them women. Three died in prison. With this holocaust Bonner ceased his burnings until April, 1557. But other bishops kept up the work during the whole year, burning men, women, and even an infant child; so that, in all, between eighty and ninety victims were sacrificed on the altar of popery in the course of this year.*

* *Fox*, III. 592–95, 639; *Burnet, ut sup.* *Fox* says that "these months of September, November, and December, [1556,] as they were troublesome to divers other places, and especially to the diocese of Canterbury * * * so likewise they brought no little business in the country, to Litchfield and Coventry, by a cruel bishop

For two years, now, popery had reigned triumphant in England; and during that time it had sent nearly one hundred Christian men and women to the stake. And these poor Christians, let it be remembered, had not the privilege of an open trial. They were rarely confronted with witnesses; they had no skilful attorneys to defend them. Nothing of the kind! But caught up on suspicion, by the bishops' officers, or on the reports of hired spies, they were hurried off to the common jails, or to the bishops' own prisons, or coal-holes, loaded with manacles in many cases, and then, without any specific information of what they were to be charged with, arraigned at the bishops' good pleasure, and after being browbeaten and abused by their haughty judges, generally disposed of summarily, and driven off to the stake in pairs, or larger companies, like sheep to the slaughter.

Such was the experience of scores of freeborn

there, called Ralph Baine, and a more cruel chancellor, named Dr. Draicon." He gives a list of about sixty persons who suffered in various ways, in this diocese, during the month of September alone, as it would seem; and these he gives as a sample only of "what a number there were, not only in the county of Litchfield, but also in other parts, in heart set against the pope's proceedings, if that fear rather than conscience had not compelled them to the contrary." In summing up the history of this year, he says: "The number of all which [were] slain and martyred in divers places of England, at sundry times this year [1556], came to above *eighty-four* persons, * * * besides them which otherwise by secret practice were made away, or driven out of goods and houses, or out of the realm, or else within the realm were put to penance." — Vol. III. p. 638.

Englishmen, for two full years, ending with Feb ruary, 1556-7. And what was accomplished b this tyrannical cruelty, and these wholesale mur ders? Was heresy — as a belief in the gospel wa then called — suppressed? Was the number o believers even diminished? Nothing of the kind The queen had to learn, to her deep chagrin, afte all this slaughtering of the innocents, that th number of "heretics" rather increased than dimin ished under her maternal discipline. Complaint were made, too, that the inferior magistrate throughout the kingdom had become slack i searching out the heretics; and that, in the citie particularly, they were even protected and encou aged, the people generally having become utterl disgusted with the queen's bloody sway. But a this, instead of satisfying the court that protestant ism could never be burnt out of the heart of th English nation, any more than popery could b burnt in — as it would have done any but a priest guided government — only stirred up their catholi majesties and their obedient councillors to devis other and more stringent measures to suppress th truth and to establish popery. Letters were writ ten to different towns, directing the people t choose more catholic mayors, and even designat ing the persons to be chosen. A scheme was als concocted for the establishment of a grand centra inquisitorial court, in London, with inferior court in other sections of the country, for the suppressio and complete eradication of "heresy" and kindre

crimes. On the 8th of February, 1556-7, a royal commission was issued "to the right reverend father in God, Edmond [Bonner] bishop of London," the bishop of Ely, lords Windsor and North, Bourne, one of the secretaries of state, and several other officers of the court, knights, and doctors of the law, etc., in all twenty-two, "trusty and well-beloved" papists, any three of whom were authorized, appointed, and assigned to be the queen's commissioners, "to inquire, as well by the oaths of twelve good and lawful men, as by witnesses, and *all other means and politic ways* you can devise, of all and sundry heresies, heretical opinions, *Lollardies*, heretical and seditious books, concealments, contempts, conspiracies, and of all false rumors, tales, seditions, and clamorous words and sayings, raised, published, bruited, invented, or set forth against us, or either of us, or against the quiet governance and rule of our people and subjects, by books, letters, tales, or otherwise, in any county, city, borough, or other place or places within this our realm of England, and elsewhere in any place or places beyond the sea," etc.* And

* *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. p. 697; and bk. II. Records, No. 82. "Heretical books" were the special terror of Mary's councillors, and in addition to various other methods adopted to this end, several royal proclamations were made against them, and the most active measures adopted to prevent their circulation. Thus, on the 13th of June, 1555, appeared a proclamation against Luther's books, and those of the chief foreign Reformers, and against most of the English Reformers', as Coverdale's, Tyndale's, Cranmer's, Frith's, Roy's, and even *Hall's Chronicles*. — *Fox*, vol. III. p. 225.

all justices of the peace, mayors, sheriffs, bailiffs, constables, and all other officers, ministers, and faithful subjects, were commanded to help these commissioners, at their command.

Here certainly are powers, ample as can well be conceived, conferred on any three of the trusty persons named, to proceed, in any way they might judge best, to suppress and punish anything they chose to pronounce heretical, or injurious to the reigning powers in Church and State. If this commission was not the very Spanish Inquisition, it was certainly, in spirit, very near to that cherished popish institution. To aid this grand central court, inferior tribunals were constituted in different parts of the country, armed with needful power to carry on the hateful work of persecution and death for conscience' sake.

The effect of all these arrangements was a greatly quickened activity in the work of slaughter during the year 1557. Three men and two women

As early as about the fifth of October, 1554, *Fox* reports that "within one fortnight there were little less than threescore, as well householders as servants and prentices, apprehended and taken, and committed to sundry prisons, for having and selling of certain books which were sent into England by the preachers that fled into Germany and other countries." — Vol. III. p. 86. Most of these condemned books were such as any Christian man might lawfully and properly read and circulate; a few were more objectionable; for the persecuted protestants sometimes gave vent to their pent-up feelings in denunciatory, if not treasonable, language, as in the *Treatise on Politic Power*, and *Blasts against the Government of Women*, and *Wherein Superior Powers may be lawfully Resisted*. *Fox*, III. 826; *Collier*, VI. 176.

were burnt at Smithfield, April 12th; three were burned at Southwark, May 3d; three more were burnt at Bristol on the 7th; two men and five women were burnt at Maidstone, June 18th, and on the next day, three men and four women were burnt at Canterbury — "fourteen being thus, in two days, destroyed by Thornton and Harpsfield." On the 22d of the same month, six men and four women were burnt at Lewes, in Sussex. One of these ten Lewes martyrs was Richard Woodman, of whom Fox gives a very extended account. He was an iron-maker by trade, of the parish of Warbleton, in Sussex. He was twice arrested. On his first arrest, in June, 1553, he lay in the King's Bench prison nearly a year and a half, and then was put into Bonner's coal-hole for a month before he was even examined. On the 18th of December, 1555, he was discharged, with four other prisoners, after having undergone twenty-six examinations. He had been at liberty but a little while before he was sought after again, but escaped, and after lying in the woods six or seven weeks, went abroad; but being unhappy there, he came home again, and was betrayed by his own father and brother; and so was sent up to London, to Bishop Bonner, a second time. There he remained in the coal-house eight weeks lacking one day, and underwent six more examinations. His second arrest was in 1557. At length he was condemned to death; but before his death he wrote out accounts of his several examinations, and a letter to a Chris-

tian friend. In this letter he says, among other like things: "I do earnestly believe that God, which hath begun this good work in me, will perform it to the end, as he hath given me grace, and will alway, to bear his easie yoke and light burden; the which I have always found, I praise my Lord God; for when I have been in prison, wearing one while bolts, another while shackles, other while lying on the bare ground, sometimes sitting in the stocks, sometime bound with cords, that all my body hath been swollen, much like to be overcome for the pain that hath been in my flesh, sometime fain to lye without in the woods and fields, wandering to and fro, few I say that durst keep my company, for fear of the rulers; sometime brought before the justices, sheriffs, lords, doctors, and bishops; sometime called dog, sometime devil, heretick, whoremonger, traitor, thief, deceiver, with divers such like; yea, and even they that did eat of my bread, that should have been most my friends by nature, have betrayed me. Yet, for all this, I praise my Lord God that hath separated me from my mother's womb, all this that hath happened unto me hath been easie, light, and most delectable and joyful of any treasure that ever I possessed. For I praise God they are not able to prove one jot or tittle of their sayings true."

Such is a glimpse of what these poor martyrs underwent before they were given to the flames; and such was the spirit with which hundreds in England, who could say with the apostle, "I die

daily," met their lot, and bore what they had learned to call Christ's "easie yoke and light burden." *

In July, only two appear to have been burned, at Norwich; but on the 2d of August, 1557, *ten* victims, half of them women, were offered up at Colchester. These ten martyrs were a part of the twenty-two — fourteen men and eight women — who were there "apprehended at one clap," some time before, and driven up to London, to Bonner, very much as slaves were driven to market, in pairs, with a rope between them, which they were required to take hold of, and another rope around the outside arm of each, and guarded by armed men.† "That bloody butcher, Bonner," was thrown into very bad humor that these "Christian lambs" should be thus brought to his presence, attracting, as they did, a great crowd of people.

* *Fox*, III. 695. This ancient town of Lewes, in the county of Sussex, about fifty miles south from London, and its neighborhood, were somewhat famed for martyrs during Mary's reign. On the 10th of June, 1555, Derrick Carver, a brewer of Brighthampstead, or Brighthelmster, was burned in front of the Star inn, at Lewes, the people calling on him, and "beseeching God to strengthen him in the faith of Jesus Christ." — *Fox*, III. 317–20. In 1556, Harland, Oswald, Ovington, and Reed were burnt together at Lewes, after long imprisonment. A fortnight after, June 20th, 1556, Thomas Wood, a protestant minister, and Thos. Mills, were burnt on the same spot. Besides these, twenty-six others, belonging to this diocese of bishop John Christopherson, perished at the stake during this reign. — *Horsfield's Hist. of Lewes*, I. 184–88. Sussex Press, Eng., 1824, quarto, 2 vols.

† *Fox*, III. 656; *Strype's Mems.*, vol. III. pt. II. ch. 53, p. 61.



and eleven o'clock before they would come
no way would they take but through Cheaps
that they were brought to my house with
a thousand persons. Which thing I took
strange; and spake to Sir John Gressam
being with me, to tell the mayor and the
that this thing was not well suffered in th
These naughty hereticks, all the way they
through Cheapside, both exhorted the people t
part, and had much comfort *è promiscua plel*
from the promiscuous crowd. Another cau
vexation to Bonner in having such a crowd s
him was, that he had "to bear their char
which, with another company sent to him
the same time, he says, "stood me about t
nobles [about thirty-two dollars], a sum of
I thought full evil bestowed." *

All these things combined to put Bonner
of humor that he would have made quick
with them. But Pole had complained of his
sentence of a previous company belonging

some reason, Pole thought proper to let off these two-and-twenty Christian professors on their signing a confession, which did not violate their consciences — "a very easie submission," as Fox calls it. They all went back to their homes. But the activity of their enemies caused the arrest of some of them a second time, and they perished in the flames at Colchester, on the 2d of August, 1557. The sympathy of thousands assembled to witness these tragic scenes was shown by the general exclamation: "The Lord strengthen them! The Lord comfort them! The Lord pour his mercies upon them!" And this the good Lord evidently did; for these martyrs went smilingly and joyfully to the stake, praying and exhorting, and uttering words of triumph. Clasping the stake, one of them cried out: "Farewell all the world; farewell faith; farewell hope; welcome charity!" *

George Eagle, a tailor by trade, was burned at Chelmsford, in August, 1557. He was a most laborious and useful man, who travelled extensively over the kingdom, visiting the suffering saints, and gathering them for prayer and conference. This he had long done — Fox says, a year or two, "especially in Colchester and the quarters thereabout," so that he was nicknamed *Trudge-over*. For a long time Eagle baffled the diligence of his enemies. As a good soldier he endured hardness, wandering from town to town, having no abiding-

* *Fox*, III. 696–700.

place, living sometimes in the woods, and often lying abroad without covering. So active and useful a man could not of course be suffered to live long in Mary's England. The government, after employing spies to watch him, with orders to bring him, dead or alive, but all in vain, at length issued a proclamation through the counties of Essex, Suffolk, Kent, and Norfolk, offering twenty pounds sterling for his arrest as a traitor. This bribe finally secured the arrest of Eagle. He was tried and condemned as a traitor, and sentenced to be hanged, drawn, and quartered, because he had, contrary to law, assembled together more than six persons — though this was for the worship of God — and had, as was alleged, prayed "that God would turn Queen Mary's heart, or else take her away." Though thus executed as a traitor, Fox tells us that "the real cause was religion." Eagle, at his examination, denied that he had ever prayed that God should take the queen away, though he had prayed that God would turn her heart. His sentence was carried out under circumstances of revolting cruelty; he being cut down before he was dead, and his head hacked off with a blunt cleaver.*

On the 22d of December, 1557, another good man, in whose history we are particularly interested, was burnt at Smithfield. His name was John Rough, a Scotchman, a converted priest. He

* *Fox*, III. 700.

had lived abroad during the first years of Mary's reign, supporting himself by knitting "caps, hose, and such things." But, lacking some materials for his manufactures, "about the end of October" he came to London to get them. There, "hearing of the secret society and holy congregation of God's children there assembled, he joined himself to them; and afterwards, being elected their minister and preacher, continued most virtuously exercised in that godly fellowship" until the 12th of December, when the congregation was betrayed by a false brother, brought in unawares, and Rough and his deacon, Sympson, and some others were seized, as they were assembling for worship at the Saracen's Head, in Islington.

After several examinations, Rough was sent to Newgate prison, and the minutes of his examinations were put into Bonner's hands. This bloody man lost no time in preparing charges against his prisoner; and calling him before him, accused him of speaking against "the seven sacraments" — but especially of affirming, that, in the sacrament of the altar, there was not present, really and truly, the very body and blood of Christ; that confession to a priest, and absolution by him, were neither necessary nor available: also, that he disliked the existing religion and ecclesiastical service of the kingdom; that he had spoken against the pope, and had persuaded others to speak and do likewise; and that he was familiar with those who had fled the country on account of religion, and

had succored and helped them, and had brought their "seditious letters and books into the realm," etc. Rough admitted the truth of these charges, and so provoked Bonner by his plain dealing that the wild beast sprang upon him, "plucked off a piece of his beard," and hurried him off to Smithfield, where he was burnt at six o'clock in the morning. In company with this bold, good man perished Margaret Mearing, for like "heresies." *

And so the work went on nearly through the year, making an aggregate of seventy-nine victims, fifteen of whom were women: nearly double the number that had suffered during either of the preceding years of Mary's reign.

Through January and February, 1557-8, the fires of persecution were allowed to smoulder; for the fifth of Mary's parliaments was then in session, and it was remarked that "the bishops, when the parliament was sitting, did always intermit their cruelties." Parliament opened January 20th, and was prorogued March 7th, to November 5th, 1558.† Spain and France were now at war, and England had been drawn into the quarrel. Scotland, too, had shown a disposition to renew her hereditary contest with England; the queen's treasury was exhausted, and this parliament was called to raise supplies. But the nation had been irri-

* *Fox*, III. 722–25.

† *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. pp. 363, 730; *Statutes*, 4 and 5 Philip and Mary, vol. IV. p. 318; *Parl. Hist.*, vol. III. pp. 354–59, Hansard, vol. I. pp. 629–32.

tated almost beyond endurance by the merciless persecutions which the queen had driven on with fiendish zeal. Another cause of bitter irritation was the loss of Calais, the key to France, which the English had held for two hundred and ten years. This stronghold was captured by the French, January 7th, 1557-8. And when parliament met on the 20th, the commons were found in anything but a compliant temper. It was said, that the queen had put the government into the hands of priests, who neither understood war nor were sensible of the honor of the nation; that they had drained the treasury to advance their ecclesiastical projects, and being aware how much the nation hated them, had set the queen on other ways of raising money than by parliament. There had been no parliament now for two years. And the poor pope-wedded and priest-driven queen, whose heart had never manifested an emotion of pity for the hundreds of victims whom she had dragged into the flames, and the thousands of mourning friends — this same hateful woman felt so keenly the complaints of her subjects, and above all, the shame of losing a fortress which had been the pride of a long line of English monarchs, and which had cost the nation much blood and treasure, that, if we may credit good catholic authority, it broke her heart.* However this may be, the dis-

* Mary is said to have ascribed her death to the loss of Calais; and to have declared, that, if her heart should be examined after

order into which the kingdom had fallen, while the queen and her councillors were chiefly intent on killing protestants and establishing popery in the country, ending with the loss of Calais, no doubt contributed materially to the sufferings of the unhappy queen, if it did not hasten her death.

Soon after the adjournment of parliament, the burnings were resumed. On the 28th of March, Deacon Cuthbert Sympson, a layman,* a tailor by trade, and Hugh Fox and John Devenish were burnt at Smithfield. They had been in prison since December 13th, 1557, and Sympson, at least, had been subjected to one of those "politic ways" for converting heretics which had been authorized by the royal commission issued in February of the preceding year. Three times he had been racked, and at one time he was three hours on the rack; and other torments had been employed, to make him divulge the names of the protestant church of which he was a deacon, and who met in the fields

her death, *Calais* would be found written upon it. — *Lingard*, vol. VII. ch. III. p. 237. *Fox* relates, that Master Rice and Mistress Clarentius, who were "most familiar with her, and most bold about her," told her at a certain time, that "they found she took thought for King Philip's departing from her. 'Not that only,' said she, 'but when I am dead and opened, you shall find *Calais* lying on my heart.'"

* *Burnet* speaks of him as "in deacon's orders." He was a deacon, but not a preaching deacon. He is called by his pastor, Mr. Rough, *a tailor*. — *Fox*, III. 724. *Fox* says that Rough was "the minister of the congregation," and Sympson "the deacon also of the said godly company or congregation." — Vol. III. p. 726.

and elsewhere, secretly, to worship the God of their fathers.*

In April, one only was burned, and he "was so simple a good soul, that many esteemed him half foolish." Nevertheless, he had wit enough to die like a brave good man in a good cause; and, as Fox says, "the more simplicity and feebleness of wit appeared in him, the more beastly and wretched doth it declare their cruel and tyrannical conduct" who burnt him. In May, the inquisitors made up for their recent remissness by burning three at Norwich, on the 19th, and three more at Colchester, on the 26th.

On the 5th of June, 1558, the temper of the government was still further illustrated by a proclamation against all who might have in their possession anti-papal books, such as the foreign protestants were constantly smuggling into the kingdom, and some of the persecuted English themselves were occasionally publishing. This proclamation set forth, that, "whereas divers books, filled bothe with heresy, sedition, and treason, have of late, and be daily brought into this realm, out of foreign countries and places, beyond the seas, and some also covertly printed within this realm, and cast abroad in sundry parts thereof, whereby not only God is dishonored, but also an encouragement given to disobey lawful princes and gov-

* The story of Cuthbert Sympson's sufferings is given at length by *Fox*, III. 726–28.

ernors; the king and queen's majesties for redress hereof do by this present proclamation declare and publish to all their subjects, that whoever shall, after the proclaiming hereof, be found to have any of the said wicked books, or finding them do not forthwith burn the same, without showing or reading the same to any other person, shall in that case be reputed and taken for a rebel, and shall, without delay, be executed for that offence, according to the order of martial law." *

Some time about the last of April, a company of about forty men and women were discovered "secretly in a back close, in the field, by the town of Islington, sitting together at prayer, and virtuously occupied in meditation of God's holy word." Their devotional exercises were interrupted by the appearance of a band of armed men, headed by the constable of Islington. Twenty-two of the company were arrested and taken before Sir Roger Cholmley, and by him sent to Newgate. After lying in prison about seven weeks, seven of them were brought before Bonner, on the 14th of June; and after repeated examinations, in which they were charged with nothing worse than a rejection of the peculiar doctrines and practices of popery, were finally condemned to the fire. They suffered, with unflinching and joyful courage, at Smithfield, June 27th, 1558. The day they were led out to the slaughter, a proclamation was made, forbid-

* *Fox*, III. 732.

ding any one to speak to them, receive anything from them, touch them, pray for them, or even say, "God help them," on pain of imprisonment without either bail or mainprise; nevertheless, the people would cry out, "God strengthen them!"*

On the 14th of July, six more of these Islington prisoners were burnt at Brentford, seven miles from London. Besides these, two of the company died in prison. The remainder were kept in prison, and made to suffer in various ways — by being put into the stocks, being fed on bread and water, and by corporal punishment, Bonner himself trying his hand at beating them with a rod until weary with the pastoral exercise.†

The work of persecution went moderately on up to the 10th day of November, when five martyrs perished at Canterbury — three men and two women; and this finished the bloody offerings for this year, making in all thirty-nine victims.

On the 5th of November, 1558, Mary's last parliament reassembled, amidst general gloom and discontent, disorder, sickness, and death at home, and war abroad. The kingdom had been greatly impoverished to carry on a war with France, in order to gratify the queen's husband. To support this war the queen had been compelled to borrow a

* It is probable that these martyrs belonged to the same church which was interrupted at the Saracen's Head, Dec. 12th of the previous year.

† *Fox*, III. 782–41.

great deal of money from the city of London, and from most of the rich men in the kingdom; and it is said that she even condescended to take the most trifling sums — fifty, forty, twenty, and even ten pounds — wherever she could not extort more; "which," Strype says, "caused a great grudging among the people, because, but the year before, she had borrowed from the city and of most rich men in all parts of the nation."* On the meeting of parliament, one of the first objects of the queen was to secure a subsidy. But the commons seemed quite ill-disposed to make such a grant; and while they talked, intelligence was brought to them that the queen was dead. She died of dropsy, accompanied by "a feverish distemper," which prevailed extensively at that time,

* *Parl. Hist.*, III. 857, 858; *Strype's Ecc. Mems.*, vol. III. pt. II. ch. 62, p. 128.

Stowe says: "In the month of March [1557-8] a prest was granted to the queen by the citizens of London, of twenty thousand pounds; which was levied of the companies; for the which sum to be repaid again, the queen bound certain lands, and also allowed for interest for the money twelve pounds of every hundred a year." — *Chronicle*, p. 632. In the year 1556, "the queen demanded a loan of six thousand pounds from one thousand persons; she exacted a loan of one hundred pounds from every person possessing [an income of] twenty pounds a year; she extorted sixty thousand marks from seven thousand yeomen; and exacted thirty-six thousand pounds from the cloth merchants trading to Antwerp, and upon refusal seized on their ships and cargoes, laying upon each piece of cloth a subsidy of twenty shillings; to get this duty abolished, they paid her forty thousand pounds, and engaged for two thousand pounds more, payable in a month." — *Wade's British Chronology*, p. 137. Lond. 1844.

and carried off many persons of quality.* Her disease was probably aggravated by the neglect of her husband, who forsook her after he found that there was no hope of an heir for the English throne; and by her anxiety on account of the disorder into which the affairs of the state had fallen, by the mismanagement of her ghostly counsellors, the climax of which was the loss of Calais. Mary was in the forty-third year of her age, and had reigned five years, three months, twenty-eight days — days and months and years of darkness and distress, of shame and humiliation, to England.

It is hard for a protestant to speak with calmness of the reign of this Mary; and even the Romanists have found it a difficult task to discover her excellences and defend her reign. Her consistency in persecuting is shocking. A man, and even a woman, in a sudden heat of passion, may do most barbarous acts; but to find a monarch, and a woman, reared among civilized, not to say Christianized people, who for successive years could keep up such a systematic butchery of men,

* Strype, and Dr. Haddon in *Strype's Mems.*, vol. III. pt. II. ch. 64, pp. 138–44.

Fuller says: "She, melancholic in mind, unhealthful in body, little feared of her foreign foes, less beloved by her native subjects, not over-dear to her own husband, unsuccessful in her treaties for peace, and unfortunate in her undertakings for war, having deceived the gentry of Norfolk and Suffolk by her false promises, was deceived herself by a false conception; and having consumed so many of God's saints by fire, died herself by water, an hydropical tympany." — Vol. IV. p. 200.

women, and even youth, spotless in their morals, and unoffending in their lives — except in the matter of their conscientious religious belief — as did this popish queen of England, we must look only to Romish church history.

Mary's reign is evidently an unwelcome episode in Dr. Lingard's history of England. He makes the best of it; but his defence of Mary is feeble, and apparently not very hearty.* Dodd, another catholic historian, in his Church History, apologizes for Mary, and smoothes over her persecutions more than Lingard does.† Hume, in summing up Mary's character, says: "She possessed few qualities either estimable or amiable; and her person was as little engaging as her behavior and address. Obstinacy, bigotry, violence, cruelty, malignity, revenge, tyranny; every circumstance of her character took a tincture from her bad temper and narrow understanding. And amidst that complication of vices which entered into her composition, we shall scarcely find any virtue but *sincerity*, a quality which she seems to have maintained through her whole life, except in the beginning of her reign," etc. ‡

Not to insist on the exception to Mary's *sincerity* to which Hume alludes — though this exception is sufficiently broad — there is another on record, which the historian must have overlooked. I

* *Hist. Eng.*, vol. VII. ch. III. pp. 257–87.
† Vol. III. pp. 106, 107.
‡ *Hist. Eng.*, vol. IV. ch. 37, p. 141.

refer to her submission, from "the bottom of her heart and stomach," to her father, made in 1536. In this document, she puts soul and body, for time and eternity, into the hands of her most princely father. She says, among other things of the same import: "As I have, and shall, knowing your excellent learning, virtue, wisdom, and knowledge, put my soul into your direction; and by the same have, and will in all things from henceforth direct my conscience, so my body I do wholly commit to your mercy and fatherly piety, desiring no state, no condition, nor no meaner degree of living, but such as your grace shall appoint me; acknowledging and confessing, that my state cannot be so vile, as either the extremity of justice would appoint unto me, or as mine offences have required or deserved." And in a letter to Cromwell, the king's vicegerent, upon the same topic, Mary says: "For mine opinion touching pilgrimages, purgatory, reliques, and such like, I assure you I have none at all, but such as I shall receive from him who hath mine whole heart in keeping, that is, the king's most gracious highness, my most benign father, who shall imprint in the same touching these matters and all other, what his inestimable virtue, high wisdom, and excellent learning shall think convenient, and limit unto me." How much of sincerity or truth was there in all this turning up of her heart? Mary, it is true, was sufficiently resolute in the maintenance of her popish principles during Edward's reign; but there were personal and selfish reasons enough

for this; and she well knew that she had little to fear from Edward. Under her father it was otherwise; and she was then sufficiently craven-spirited and hypocritical.*

The work of persecution may be said to have begun with Mary's reign, in August, 1553; but the burnings did not begin until about eighteen months after, on February 4th, 1554-5. From that day the fires of martyrdom were never extinguished but for a short time until seven days before this unhappy, wicked woman died, when five persons — three men and two women — were burned at Canterbury.† The great end of this persecution was not merely to silence and overawe protestantism, and to establish popery in the land, but utterly to root out and destroy all who disbelieved, or even doubted, the divinity of popery. Protestants were forbidden to leave the kingdom, and were hunted down with the most pertinacious cruelty. Spies were everywhere busy; a premium was set on the head of those who could not be trapped by ordinary means; proclamations were fulminated, and royal letters were repeatedly sent out, to stir up the magistrates, and even the bishops, to greater activity in hunting for the precious lives of God's people. The slightest suspicion was sufficient to cause the arrest of man or woman, their immediate confinement in the filthy public prisons, or in the dungeons and

* *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. p. 488, and Records, Nos. 3–6.
† *Burnet, ut sup.* p. 732–; *Fox*, III. 750.

coal-holes of the bishops; where they were laid in irons, thrust into the stocks, racked, and otherwise tormented, to make them betray themselves or their friends. A series of carefully drawn and artful questions were put to them, which they were compelled to answer at once, and categorically, or by their refusal expose themselves to immediate condemnation for contumacy. Collier, by no means a partial friend of the protestants, says: "To speak clearly, their judges seldom showed much inclination to preserve them. They were nice and particular in their inquiry; they put the tests home, and pressed the corporal presence and transubstantiation in the most ensnaring terms; neither would they be satisfied with less than distinct and categorical answers." *

The number who were thus trapped and killed is variously estimated. The lowest number is that made by Lingard, who says: "After making every allowance, it will be found that in the space of four years [three years and nine months] almost two hundred persons perished in the flames for religious opinions." † Other authorities raise the number as high as eight hundred. But, besides those who perished in the flames for their religious opinions, a very considerable number died in prison. Sixty are known thus to have died; ‡ and it is quite probable that many more perished miserably in

* *Collier*, VI. 113. † *Hist. Eng.*, vol. VII. ch. II. p. 285.
‡ *Burnet, ut sup.* p. 782.

this way, of whom we have no account. Then, let it be considered how many, who escaped the hands of their persecutors, must have shattered their health and shortened their lives by exposures and hardships, in their efforts to avoid being arrested. The life of poor Eagle ("Trudge-over"), hunted as a wild beast through fields and forests, gives us a glimpse of the life of many a poor, persecuted saint of those times. Cecil, Lord Burleigh, who wrote in the succeeding reign, in his "Execution of Justice," makes the number of public executions about four hundred, besides those who were secretly murdered in prison. Heylyn, an historian by no means ultra-protestant, says: "The martyrs in all parts of the kingdom amounted to the number of two hundred and seventy-seven persons, of all sorts and sexes. But more particularly; there are said to have perished in these flames, five bishops, twenty-one divines, eight gentlemen, eighty-four artificers, one hundred husbandmen, servants and laborers, twenty-six wives, twenty widows, nine virgins, two boys, and two infants. Sixty-four more in those furious times were persecuted for their faith; whereof seven were whipped, sixteen perished in prisons, twelve were buried in dunghills, and many more lay in captivity, condemned, which were delivered by the opportune death of Queen Mary." * Strype, one of the most

* I quote from *Dodd's Church History*, the work of a Roman Catholic priest, vol. II. p. 106. London, 1839.

painstaking and accurate of writers, gives the number of executions, and the counties and places where these took place, during the four years of the persecution. He makes the whole number of executions in the year 1555, seventy-one; in 1556, eighty-nine; in 1557, eighty-eight; in 1558, forty; total, two hundred and eighty-eight!* Burnet makes the total number of executions two hundred and eighty-four.†

From these several statements of men who had the opportunity to investigate the subject, with a fair allowance for the number who must have lost their lives in this persecution, though not actually burned at the stake, we may safely conclude that the number of protestant victims offered to the Moloch of popery during Mary's reign could not have been less than Lord Burleigh estimated —*four hundred persons!* or, on an average, more than two victims a week from the beginning to the end of the persecution. Add to this list the thousand suffering English refugees on the continent; and consider the number of poor, bereaved, and suffering wives and orphan children, and the poverty, the distress, and the broken health occasioned by this merciless persecution; and consider, too, that all this burden of suffering, for nearly four years, was forced on these men, women, and children, not because they were immoral in their lives, or disloyal

* *Strype's Ecc. Mems.*, vol. III. pt. II. Catalogue, No. 85.

† *Hist. Ref.*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. p. 732.

in their characters, or lawless in their habits — for they were the very reverse of all this — but simply and solely because, instead of the pope, they feared God, and strove to keep his commandments, as revealed in his most holy word — let the reader consider these facts, and he will understand why Mary Tudor is called the "BLOODY MARY!"

Mary's reign was a miserably memorable one for England in other respects, if we may credit the old writers of that period. We are told, for example, that during one year the country was visited with "immoderate rains and tempests"; and that "intolerable heats and droughts" prevailed another year. Then we are called to consider "what penury and scarceness of corn and victuals, what hunger and famine followed! what diseases and sicknesses everywhere prevailed, the like whereof had never before been known! Hot, burning fevers, strange diseases, began in 1556, and increased more and more in 1557 and 1558." In the summer of 1557 these raged horribly, and killed an exceeding great number, especially of gentlemen and men of wealth.* Besides all this, the country was drained of its wealth, was loaded with debt, and was covered with shame by the loss of its hereditary possessions on the continent!

* *Strype*, vol. III. pt. II. pp. 156, 157; *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. p. 734.

Strype says: "She left the nation in a poor, mean condition, sunk in their spirits with persecution, and the sense of their shame in the loss of Calais." — *Ut sup.* p. 145.

In less than twenty-four hours after the queen's death, her distinguished kinsman, and one of the wisest and best of her counsellors, Cardinal Pole, archbishop of Canterbury, closed his checkered and eventful life, in the fifty-ninth year of his age.* He died, according to Fuller, "neither of Italian physic, wilfully taken by himself, as an English author insinuates, nor of poison given to him by the protestants, as a Spanish writer suggests, but of a quartan fever, then epidemical in England, and malignant above the ordinary nature of that disease." †

Parliament was in session at the time of Mary's death; and at about nine o'clock on the 17th of November, the lord chancellor went to the house

* Mary died between five and six o'clock, A. M., November 17th, 1558, and Pole died at about three o'clock the following morning. — *Soames' Hist. Ref.*, IV. 595; *Fuller's Church History*, vol. IV. bk. VIII. p. 244, note *b*. The author of the note says, "he [Pole] outlived the queen but *sixteen* hours; she dying between five and six o'clock in the morning, and he about three o'clock the succeeding morning." This would make the time between their deaths, not sixteen, but about *twenty-one* or *two* hours. *Burnet* (*ut sup.* p. 741–) speaks in respectful and kind terms of Pole, or Pool, as he calls him. He says: "He was a learned, modest, humble, and good-natured man; and had indeed such qualities, and such a temper, that, if he could have brought the other bishops to follow his measures, or the pope and queen to approve of them, he might have probably done much to have reduced this nation to popery again. But God designed better things for it; so he gave up the queen to the bloody counsels of Gardiner and the rest of the clergy. It was the only thing in which she was not led by the cardinal."

† *Church History*, *ut sup.* pp. 245, 246.

of lords and informed them of the event. Soon after, a message was sent by the lords to the lower house, requiring the speaker and the whole house to come to them, when they should hear certain matters of importance that the lords had to communicate to them.* The speaker and the commons accordingly repaired to the lords, and were told by the lord chancellor, "that God had taken the queen to his mercy, but had furnished them with another sovereign lady, my Lady Elizabeth, her grace; and then willed the commons to resort to the palace, where the lords would come and cause her grace to be proclaimed queen of England. And immediately after, the said proclamation was there made." †

Just before her death, Mary sent a message to Elizabeth, to the effect that the throne was to be left to her; and in consideration thereof, she was desired to retain all her sister's old councillors, to promise that no alterations should be made in religion, and that the queen's debts should all be paid. The impudence of this message was suit-

* *Burnet* (*ut sup.* p. 747) says: "Mary's death was concealed for some hours. What the secret consultations were upon it is not known; but the issue of them appeared about nine o'clock." But if Mary died between five and six o'clock, A. M., and the event was officially declared to parliament "about nine o'clock" the same day, it could hardly be said in truth to have been "concealed for some hours." There would seem, too, a propriety in reserving the first public knowledge of the queen's death for the parliament; and they could not have been long in session at nine A. M.

† *Parl. Hist.*, I. 632.

ably appreciated and answered by Elizabeth, who sent the queen word that she did not thank her majesty for leaving the crown to her, for it was hers by right. As to councillors, Mary had chosen her own, and she should do the same. In religion, she would be governed by God's word. The queen's debts should be paid. Elizabeth had suffered enough from Mary's religion and councillors, to make her cautious about committing herself to either.

CHAPTER X.

CONGREGATIONALISM IN QUEEN MARY'S REIGN.

In preceding chapters, the slender thread of Congregationalism has been followed through successive periods of English history, down to the commencement of Mary's reign. We have now to inquire: Is that thread still distinguishable, amidst the fire and blood of this period? The answer is, that it is; and, what is more, that it has become broader and plainer, more marked and distinctive, than ever before. Through the entire reign of the bloody Mary, distinct bodies of dissenting Christians maintained their existence in the kingdom; and these bodies had some of the essential features of Congregational churches. The names of members were enrolled; they had pastors and deacons; they held stated meetings for religious conference and worship, and the celebration of the Lord's Supper, on which occasions they took up contributions for their poor and imprisoned brethren, and attended to matters of discipline among themselves Let us now gather up the evidence which justifies these statements.

We learn from Fox, that on new year's day, 1554-5, in the evening, certain honest men and

women of the city of London, to the number of thirty, and a minister with them, named Master Rose, were taken in a house in Bowe churchyard, at the communion, and committed to prison.* And under date of December 12th, 1557, the same author gives an account of the arrest, at a tavern at Islington, of John Rough and Cuthbert Sympson, and others, "members of the secret society and holy congregation of God's children," in London. They were betrayed "through the crafty and traitorous suggestion of a false hypocrite and dissembling brother, called Roger Sargeant, tailor; and were apprehended by the vice-chamberlain of the queen's house, at the Saracen's Head, in Islington, where the congregation had then proposed to assemble themselves to their godly and accustomable exercises of prayer and hearing the word of God." † Strype thus speaks of this same congregation: "On December 12th, being Sunday, at Islington, there met certain persons that were gospellers, and

* *Acts and Mons.*, III. 98.

† *Acts and Mons.*, III. 723.

This "secret society and holy congregation of God's children" we probably have had a glimpse of before. *Fox* speaks of "the congregation" which met "in a warehouse in Bow Lane," in 1531–32, before which Bainham made his confession. — Vol. II. p. 247; and *Anderson's Annals English Bible*, vol. I. pp. 333, 334, compared with vol. II. pp. 265–71. Anderson says of this "congregation of the faithful, assembling for worship in the days of Queen Mary: with all its imperfections, there certainly never was in England a body of Christians more highly honored by God, 'in resisting unto blood, striving against sin.'"

some pretended players, and one Ruff, [Rough,] a Scot, formerly a friar. And under the pretence of a play, (which seemed indeed to be begun,) he was to have read a lecture to the assembly. And the communion was played, and should have been administered; but the guards came too soon, or ever the chief matter was begun. Of this Rough and his martyrdom something will be said in due place." *

* *Ecc. Mems.*, vol. III. pt. II. ch. 50, pp. 22, 23.

Ruft, or Rough — called by Strype, "Sir John Ruft, priest" — entered among the Blackfriars in Stirling, Scotland, at the age of seventeen years, and remained there sixteen years. The earl of Arran, lord governor of Scotland, obtained from Cardinal Beaton liberty for him to become his chaplain. After about a year, the earl thought fit to dismiss from his service all who favored the new opinions, and so discharged Rough. After this he continued to preach in St. Andrews and elsewhere, part of the time in company with Knox, until Edward's reign. He then preached in England until Mary's persecution; then went abroad, but returning on business, he lost his life. A sermon preached by Rough, at St. Andrews, Scotland, is said to have been made a great blessing to John Knox, and to have been the means of bringing him forth to engage in his public ministry.

This sermon related to "the election of ministers," wherein he set forth "what power the congregation, how small soever it was, passing the number of two or three, had above any man in whom they supposed and espied the gifts of God to be, and how dangerous it was to refuse, and not to hear the voice of such as desire to be instructed." He then addressed Knox personally, and charged him not to refuse the holy vocation to which he was called. Knox burst into tears, and withdrew to his chamber. But on a following Sabbath he appeared in the pulpit, according to appointment, and commenced his preaching career. — *Biographia Britannica*, art. *Knox*, vol. IV. pp. 2864–66; *Anderson's Annals*, II. 265–68.

That this was not a mere casual meeting of good men and women for religious purposes is suggested by Fox's remark, that they were engaged in "their *accustomable* exercises of prayer," etc. This appears also from the statement that Rough, coming to London and "hearing of the secret society and holy congregation of God's children there assembled, joined himself to them, and afterwards being elected their minister and preacher, continued most virtuously exercised in that godly fellowship, teaching and confirming them in the truth of the gospel of Christ." The character of this assemblage appears still clearer from the account given of Cuthbert Sympson, the deacon of this church — not a man "in deacon's orders," as Burnet calls him, but a simple, apostolic deacon; a layman, a tailor by trade — who kept the records of the church; or, as Fox tells us, a book containing "the names and accounts of the congregation." Understanding Sympson's relation to the "secret society and holy congregation," Bonner did his utmost to make him produce the church records, or reveal the names and residences of the congregation. He was put into the stocks, in Bonner's coal-hole; he was racked repeatedly in the Tower, and tormented in various other ways; and was at last burnt at the stake, on the 28th of March, 1558, in company with two others; but all in vain, for the good man would not betray his brethren. Strype, in speaking of this *auto-de-fé*, says: "One whereof was Cuthbert Sympson, the faithful deacon of the con-

gregation, who endured infinite tortures, to make him confess and discover the names of members of this congregation, which he would not."* And Fox says: "This Cuthbert Sympson was a man of faithful and zealous heart to Christ and his true flock, insomuch that he never ceased laboring and studying most earnestly, not only how to preserve them without corruption of the popish religion, but also his care was very vigilant how to keep them together without peril or danger of persecution."

At Rough's examination, Bonner charged him with having "in sundry places of this realm, since the queen's reign, ministered and received the communion as it was used in the late days of King Edward VI.," and with knowing "of divers that yet do keep books of the said communion, and used the same in private houses out of the church, and entertain opinions against the sacrament of the altar." To this Rough replied, "that he did well like the communion used in King Edward's day; but he had not ministered or received the same here in England since the queen's reign, neither yet knew any that had the books thereof." †

In April of this year, we get another glimpse of this same "secret society and godly congregation" of believers, near where their pastor, deacon, and some others were arrested four months before, "sitting together at prayer, and virtuously occupied

* *Ecc. Mems.*, vol. III. pt. II. ch. 58, pp. 110.

† *Acts and Mons.*, III. 724, Quest. and Ans. 4.

in meditation of God's holy word," "secretly in a back close, in the field, by the town of Islington." There were about forty persons present at this meeting, twenty-two of whom were arrested and sent to Newgate, thirteen of whom were burnt, and two died in prison. At their examination before Bonner, they were charged with not going to their parish churches; not going in processions; not conforming to the customs, rites, and ceremonies of the churches; neglecting confession and the absolution of the priests; not receiving the sacrament; not believing in the corporeal presence in the sacrament; not believing the faith and religion then observed in the church of England to be a true faith and religion in all points; not regarding the common Latin service as good and lawful and according to God's word; approving the service in English and the Book of Common Prayer of Edward VI.; and, instead of going to their parish churches, going in time of divine service into the fields and profane places, to read English psalms and certain English books.* These were, for substance, the heavy crimes charged against these poor Christians, and for which they were mercilessly burned to death.

We have in these details, certainly, very distinct intimations of the existence of an organized church or churches in London, having their members

* *Fox*, III. 782. The account given of the examination of these good men shows that they possessed much of the spirit of the old Lollards.

enrolled, holding meetings for preaching, and for prayer and conference, choosing pastors, and having lay deacons, whose work had special reference to the temporalities of the church. Bonner called this body "the church of schismatics and heretics."* He was doubtless correct in calling them a "church," and if his faith and practice were the standard, they were schismatics and heretics too.

The church in London is said to have been formed soon after Mary's accession, and to have consisted of as many as two hundred members at a time. Their meetings were often held near Aldgate, though the place of meeting was frequently changed: sometimes at Sir Thos. Cardene's, at Blackfriars; in a cooper's shop, Pudden Lane; in

* See Bonner's speech to Roger Holland, "a merchant tailor of London," but who describes himself as a poor, unlearned layman, an apprentice to some handicraft. Holland was, nevertheless, a very sensible, intelligent, and shrewd man. Bonner seems to have been impressed with these traits of character, and sought by fair as well as foul means to persuade Holland to recant, but without the least success. The entire story, as given by Fox, is extremely interesting; and when we read Holland's apt and scriptural replies to Bonner's arguments, and his quick and sharp retorts on his attacks, we are forcibly reminded of some of those brave old Lollards who fought the same power of "the beast" in England a century before. — *Fox*, III. 737. See *Anderson's* interesting account of Holland's trial and death; and particularly his declaration, or prophecy, addressed to those present at his condemnation: "After this day [June 28th, 1558] in this place, there shall not be any by him [Bonner] put to the trial of fire and fagot." And he and his companions in very deed proved to be the last whom Bonner burned at Smithfield. — *Annals Eng. Bible*, II. 269–71.

Thomas Street; in a cloth-worker's loft, in Cheapside; in ships on the river; once or twice in a ship at Billingsgate, belonging to a good man of Lee, Essex; at other times, in a ship called "Jesus' ship," lying between Ratcliff and Roth. Sometimes they assembled in the villages around London — Islington, for some reason, being a favorite place. They were often compelled to meet in the night, and in secret places. They repeatedly had very narrow escapes from spies, and from the bishops' officers; and several times were detected, and considerable numbers of them arrested and burned. But these hazards did not deter them from continuing their meetings; and during the last year of Mary's reign their numbers and their boldness increased, so that they sometimes assembled by hundreds without detection.* They are known to have had five different ministers among them. Their first pastor was Edward Scambler, who was soon driven into exile. Their second pastor was Mr Fowler, of whom nothing more is known; their third was John Rough, who was martyred; they then chose Augustus Bernher; and finally, Thomas Bentham. Under the last named, the church increased and prospered without detection.† Bentham, in a letter to his friend Lever,

* *Clarke's Martyrology*, p. 515; *Wilson's Dissenting Churches*, vol. I. pp. 4–7; *Strype, Ecc. Mems.*, vol. III. pt. II. ch. 64, pp. 147–50. Strype mentions an instance in which a spy was converted in one of their meetings.

† *Strype* represents that "many congregations of gospellers

then at Arrow, in Switzerland, dated July 17th, 1558, gives some account of the burning of several of his brethren in Smithfield, as follows: "There were seven men burned in Smithfield, the 28th of June,* altogether; a fearful and cruel proclamation beyng made, that under payne of present death, no man shold either approche ny unto theym, nether speak unto or comfort the theym; yet were they so mightily spoken unto, so comfortably taken by the hands and so godly comforted, notwithstandyng that fearful proclamation and the present threatnyngs of the sheriff and sergyants, that the adversaryes themselves were astonyned." He says, in reference to himself: "I am every moment of an hour in danger of takyng, and fear of bodily death. I am in mynd, the Lord be praised, most

continued in London throughout this reign, from the beginning to the end of it, in spite of the hardships thereof, and notwithstanding the taking off so many of their number." He further represents, that "there was one chief congregation above the rest, the pastor whereof was as superintendent. Their pastors were Mr. Scambler, afterwards bishop; Mr. Fowler; Thomas Rose; Rough (a Scot), afterwards burnt; Aug. Bernher, Latimer's faithful servant. The last year of the queen succeeded in this office Thomas Bentham, lately an exile in Germany, afterwards bishop of Litchfield." To this list of pastors, Brook adds the name of John Pullain. — *Ecc. Mems.*, vol. III. pt. II. ch. 63, pp. 132, 147; *Brook's Puritans*, vol. I. Introd. p. 14; *Anderson's Annals Eng. Bible*, II. 266.

* In the letter it is "the 28th of *July*," which is manifestly a mistake — a slip of his pen or a misprint — for Bentham says at the close of this letter: "Written at London, the 17th of July." *Fox* places this martyrdom one day earlier, "about" June 27th. — Vol. III. 782–84.

quiet and joyful; seying the fervent zeal of so many, and such increase of our congregation in the midst of this cruel and violent persecution." * And Strype tells us, that at the burning, as soon as Bentham saw the fire put to them, he cried aloud to the people: "'We know they are the people of God; and therefore we cannot choose but wish well to them, and say, *God strengthen them!*' And then added: 'GOD ALMIGHTY, FOR CHRIST'S SAKE, STRENGTHEN THEM!' and he was presently answered by multitudes, 'AMEN, AMEN!' to the amazement of the officers." †

At their meetings, "the gospellers" took up collections for the poor, and for the imprisoned saints; and most liberal collections these must have been, for we are told that these little congregations sometimes gave *ten pounds sterling* at a collection; which, considering the value of money in those days — at least five times greater than at present — was equal to about two hundred and fifty dollars Federal money! And there appear to have been men among them who, if not chosen by the congregations for the purpose, volunteered to visit the prisons and comfort and relieve the saints confined there — Relievers. Strype gives the names of two of these brave men: Robert Coles and John Ledley, who "were great concealers and har-

* *Strype's Ecc. Mems.*, vol. III. pt. II. ch. 68, pp. 183, 184; *Wilson's Dis. Chh.*, I. 6, 7.

† *Ecc. Mems., ut sup.* p. 185.

borers of good men; and resorted to the King's Bench, to the prisoners there about religion." *

We have no reason to suppose that independent dissenting churches were confined to London. For, though our information about the London churches is fuller and more definite than it is about those in other parts of the kingdom, yet there are scattered items of information in the accounts of the general persecution, sufficient to confirm the conclusions to which we should naturally come from analogy and from our knowledge of the history of dissent in England — that there were many protestant, dissenting churches in different parts of the kingdom during Mary's reign.† The story of George Eagle, or Eagles, already alluded to,‡ is to the point. This good man was nicknamed "Trudge," or "Trudge-over," or "Trudge-over-the-world," because of his extraordinary and continual travels over the kingdom, for the purpose of exhorting and comforting the poor, persecuted saints. The activity and the usefulness of this itinerant laborer were so great, that the council at length gave orders to have him waylaid and caught. "But he and his company concealed themselves a great

* *Strype's Ecc. Mems.*, vol. III. pt. II. ch. 53, p. 63; ch. 64, p. 147.

† *Anderson* says: "We have alluded to a congregation of these people ['the earliest resemblance of a Christian church founded on the Scriptures' of those days], meeting in London; but there were groups in secret, throughout different counties." — *Annals*, I. 344.

‡ Page 321 of this volume.

while in the northern parts of Essex, in privy closets, and barns, in holes and thickets, in fields and woods." And it was not until a reward of twenty pounds was offered for him that he was caught, near the town of Colchester. "His haunts," according to Strype, extended over four counties — Essex, Suffolk, Norfolk, and Kent. And in another place, Strype says that "at the latter end of the year 1557, the 'gospellers' and 'professors' did more boldly than before exercise their religion, and make an open profession of it, particularly in Much Bentley." They assembled in service time, in private houses, and kept their schools of heresy there. And particular mention is made of Ralph Allerton, of Bentley, on the Colchester side, who, "having good learning, did use to read the English testament and other good books, and to pray with the well-disposed professors, meeting together in houses, and woods, and sometimes in churches too." And we read of "several other pious men in the said county of Essex, that preached and exhorted, and travelled about for the edification of the professors of the gospel in those parts."*

We learn from other sources. that "there was a considerable congregation of these excellent Christians at Stoke, in Suffolk; with whom, on account

* *Ecc. Mems., ut sup.* pp. 61–63. For further particulars about Colchester and its martyrs, see *Suckling's Antiquities of Essex*, pp. 114–19, Lond. 1845; *Wright's Hist. Essex*, vol. I. ch. 8, particularly pp. 277, 278 and note, and 312; *Fox*, III. 697; *Strype's Ecc. Mems.*, vol. III. pt. II. ch. 63, pp. 124–26.

of their number and unanimity, the bishops were for sometime afraid to interfere. They constantly attended their private meetings, and never went to church." The bishop of Norwich tried to enforce attendance at church, and on the popish ceremonies of the church, but without effect. He finally suspended and excommunicated the whole congregation; but the officers never succeeded in arresting them.* And Strype tells us that there were in the north many professors, who had their preachers and pastors. George Marsh, who suffered at Chester, was one of them; Mr. Best, in Yorkshire, was another; and the names of Brodbank, Reneses, and Bussel are also given, as persons who went privately from place to place in Lancashire and the bordering parts, preaching and administering the sacraments to the scattered congregations of believers.

In 1555, Strype informs us that "endeavors were especially used to dispense and take off the preachers and ministers. Of these, in the county of Kent, where religion had taken good footing, were Thomas Woodgate, William Maynard, and one Harwich, who went about in that county, and in secret meetings of the gospellers preached unto them; confirming them in the doctrines they had received, and exhorting them to stand fast in those critical times. In the beginning of April, of this year, letters were sent from above, to the high

* *Clarke's Martyrology*, p. 813; *Brook's Pur.*, Intr. vol. i. p. 18.

sheriff, to seize these men, and to send them up." *

The parish of Stoke-Clare, in the county of Suffolk, near the border of Essex, is mentioned as one that was early inclined to the Reformation. And this seems to have been in consequence of the circulation in that vicinity of portions of the New Testament — no doubt Wickliffe's, which had existed in manuscript long before the publication of Tyndale's New Testament, and had prepared the minds of men to receive Tyndale's when it appeared in 1525. Anderson, in his Annals of the English Bible, copies from Bishop Tunstall's register an interesting account of the conversion of two Augustine friars, by the perusal of Tyndale's New Testament, procured by two countrymen of Stoke-Clare, who travelled to London on purpose to obtain the book. "Wickliffe's Wicket," a copy of which was found in the bedchamber of Richard Foxe, a curate, whose place one of these friars, Topley, had been employed to take for a season, seems to have begun the good work of bringing the friar into doubt about some of the popish doctrines.†

It is not probable that all these Christians were dissenters from episcopacy; or that these preachers would have hesitated to conform to the polity

* *Ecc. Mems.*, vol. III. pt. I. ch. 31, p. 401.

† See *Coverdale's Remains*, pp. viii.–ix., Parker Soc. ed.; *Anderson's Annals*, I. 185.

of the church of England as established by Edward, or even Elizabeth; but that many of them would have been non-conformists to episcopal government in either of these reigns, there can be little doubt. The burning of martyrs during Mary's reign, instead of frightening men and women out of a love and belief of simple truth, served rather as beacon-lights to guide inquiring souls to the apostolic faith and order of the churches. Thus one Dale, a promoter, or an informer, told Mr. Living, a minister, and in bonds for religion, in 1558, "you care not for burning; by God's blood (as he swore) there must be some other means found for you." * The fact was, as Strype tells us, that "so far were the persecutors from obtaining their ends, [viz: that, by burning some, the terror thereof might reduce the rest to submit to the old superstitions,] that it had a quite contrary effect. They were encouraged, and made more strong and resolute to persist in their principles, by the many examples of constancy they had so often before their eyes." So true was this, that at one of the last burnings of martyrs in London, during Mary's reign, the number of persons present — most of whom openly sympathized with the sufferers — was estimated as high as twenty thousand! And it was the responsive cry — AMEN! AMEN! — from this great multitude, to the prayer of Bentham, which filled the officers of government with such amazement, and

* *Strype*, vol. III. pt. II. ch. 62, p. 124.

probably convinced them that it was quite time to stop such exhibitions in London.

From these brief notices of the "gospellers, or professors," it is evident that there were, during Mary's reign, associations, assemblies, congregations, churches, whatever they may be called, in the different counties of England, who were not only opposed to popery, but refused to pay any respect to its Latin service, or its various rites and ceremonies; and, instead of going to the parish churches to worship, assembled in private houses, or in the woods and secret places, or more openly, by themselves for religious worship. How many of these little churches were the fruits of the popish persecution of the period, it is impossible now to determine. It is quite likely that many of them were; but that they were not all of so recent an origin appears probable from what has been said of dissenting churches under the reign of Edward.

The story of the trial of Humphrey Middleton, of Ashford, Kent, illustrates this matter. He was a member of a dissenting, or non-conforming congregation, which was troubled by the bishop's officers as early as about 1552; and was tried before Cranmer, charged with being a member of a sect newly sprung up in Kent. For his non-conformity, he was committed to prison, and was there found on Mary's accession. He appears to have been liberated from prison on the coming in of Mary; but was arrested again, and finally perished at the stake, July 12th, 1555. Fox tells us "that when

he [Middleton] and some others had been kept prisoners in the last year of Edward by the archbishop, and had been dreadfully teased by him and the rest of his commission with him, and even now just upon being condemned in open court, he said to him: 'Well, reverend sir, pass what sentence you think fit upon us; but, that you may not say you was not forewarned, I testify that your own turn will be next.'" *

This story of Middleton and his associates in Ashford shows conclusively that there were dissenting congregations in England before the time of Mary, even during Edward's reign. And if there were, we have no reason to suppose that they would be disbanded when the reign of popery began. In a previous chapter, I have gathered the scattered evidences of the existence of dissenting congregational churches in England, under Edward's reign.† I call those churches Congregational, for, in Edward's reign, when pure doctrine was recognized in the established church, and the word of God was not bound, but free to all, there would, of course, be but few dissenting congrega-

* *Acts and Mons.*, III. 301, 309, 313; *Peirce's Vindication of Dissenters*, pt. I. p. 35; *Brook's Puritans*, I. 10.

† See *ante*, pp. 250–262.

Anderson mentions the existence of congregations of good people in different parts of England, as early as 1509–21, who met to read, and hear read and expounded, Wickliffe's Bible. — *Annals*, I. 174. These were, doubtless, Lollards, of whom particular account is given in the first volume of this work.

tions, or churches, except on the ground of church polity; and in the days of Mary's persecution there could be no others than those which were substantially Congregational, for none but single congregations, organized and governed on essentially Congregational principles, could exist during those terrible days when popery was suffered to reign and burn without restraint in England. And it certainly deserves notice, that the Congregational polity may be observed as perfectly during persecution as during the most abundant prosperity. And this is no insignificant argument, by the way, in favor of Congregationalism, as the form of church government designed by the Head of the Church for universal adoption: that it is equally adapted to all circumstances in which churches may be placed — to times of persecution, as well as prosperity.

The reader will, of course, understand, that, in speaking of Congregational churches, I do not mean to intimate that these persecuted Christians, who were associated together for the worship of God and the celebration of religious ordinances, had carefully studied out the principles of church polity now known as Congregationalism. They simply enrolled themselves as members of the congregation of God's people, pledging themselves to one another, and calling God to witness the sincerity of their vows; then, taking the apostolic churches for their pattern, choosing a pastor and teacher, and one or more deacons to attend to their temporalities, they were sufficiently organized for

all necessary church purposes. Less than this they could not well do; and from the fragments of their history which we can pick up, we learn that they did all this. More than this they had no occasion to do, to constitute them essentially Congregational churches. All over England there appear to have been such sort of churches, or "congregations," as they are called, during Mary's reign; some more completely organized, and others less so, according to circumstances. Without any deliberate purpose, in most cases, doubtless, they naturally fell into substantially such organizations as have been described; some of which were brought into being during the reign of Mary, and it is likely fell apart on the restoration of protestantism in Elizabeth's reign. Others, we are justified in believing, were of an earlier date, and continued their separate existence under Elizabeth's hierarchy, as they had under Mary's and Edward's and perhaps Henry's.

That this is not mere supposition, appears from the words of the Rev. John Penry, one of the martyrs of Elizabeth's reign. In an address to the queen, dated Edinburgh, April 30th, 1593, he tells her: "If we had had Queen Mary's days, I think that we should have had as flourishing a church this day, as ever any. For it is well known, that there was then in London under the burden, and elsewhere in exile, more flourishing churches than any now tolerated by your authority. Madam, thus much we must needs say, that, in all likeli-

hood, if the days of your sister, Queen Mary, and her persecution, had continued unto this day, the church of God in England had been far more flourishing than at this day it is. For then, madam, the church of God within this land, and elsewhere, being strangers, enjoyed the ordinances of God's holy word, as far as then they saw."*

Penry, if not personally cognizant of the things of which he here speaks, yet was contemporaneous with men who took part in these scenes to which he alludes, and could not have been mistaken in his statement of facts.

The existence of these protestant congregations in Mary's time was laid hold on by the churchmen in the early part of the succeeding century (1604–10) in their controversies with the separatists, to prove a sort of unbroken succession of the church of England. They argued, that "their church was gathered by the preaching of the word; and that the first conversion of the land to the faith of Christ was by the preaching of the gospel, as appears by the best historians. And so they go on and tell us of many from age to age, called by the same means, who in the time of persecution sealed the truth with their blood, and in the time of freedom did openly profess the same." And they seem to have dwelt particularly on the presumed existence of numerous secret congregations of true believers in Queen Mary's day, who "did upon

* *Strype's Whitgift*, II. 179, 180; Paget, in *Hanbury*, I. 15.

Queen Elizabeth's entrance, openly confess the gospel," and thus become a nucleus of truth, around which the church of England was gathered, and by means of which the apostolic succession of churches, so to speak, was perpetuated and handed down.* While this argument about the number of secret congregations in Queen Mary's day was treated by the separatist as "but a boast"; and it was asserted that "there were very few of them in any" — *i. e.*, very few church-of-England believers in any of the secret congregations; it was utterly denied that there was a single congregation of them who retained their separate character, and thus joined themselves to the church of England in Elizabeth's day, or became part of that hierarchy. Robinson says: "The congregations were dissolved, and the persons in them bestowed themselves in their several parishes, where their livings and estates lay"; and he challenges his opponents to show him one of their clergy continuing his charge in Queen Elizabeth's days, over the flock to which he ministered the persecuted gospel in Queen Mary's days. Now, Robinson's assertions and arguments on this topic — one on which he must have been well informed — go to confirm the position assumed in these pages, that the organized bodies of believers in different parts

* *A Justification of Separation*, by John Robinson, pp. 485–90, in vol. ii. of Robinson's Works, 12mo.; published by the Congregational Board of Publication Society. Boston, 1851.

of the kingdom during Mary's reign were, for the most part, dissenters from hierarchal church government, whether Romish or protestant; and that they were the friends of a more simple and apostolic form of church organization and government than either Mary's or Elizabeth's hierarchy allowed.

Another argument relied on by the churchmen against the separatists, was, that some of their principal men had recanted and renounced their errors; and "one Bolton," who is called "the first broacher of this way" — this Congregational way — was instanced as an example. In replying to this invidious argument, Robinson drops an item of historical information which we might otherwise never have known; namely, that there were those who agreed with him essentially on the subject of church organization, earlier even than the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, in 1550. He says to Bernard: "It is true that Bolton was, *though not the first in this way*, an elder of a separated church in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's days; and falling away from his holy profession, recanted the same at St. Paul's Cross, and afterwards hung himself, as Judas did. And what marvel if he which had betrayed Christ in his truth, as Judas did in his person, came to the same fearful end which Judas did?" *

This assertion and argument of Bernard's was but a repetition of Giffard's, who wrote against the

* *Justification of Separation*, p. 57.

separatists as early as 1590. Giffard had asserted that "there was a church of them [separatists] eighteen years ago [*i. e.* in 1572] in London, wherein one Bolton was a chief doer, whose fearful end is not forgotten." Ainsworth replies to Bernard, that Bolton was "one of the elders of that separated church whereof Mr. Fitz was pastor, in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign; he was but a ruling elder, and not 'the *first* broacher of this way.'" *

But I am anticipating somewhat the course of our history, in order to show the probability that some of the scattered, secret, Congregational churches which existed in Mary's day, continued into Elizabeth's time.

* *Hanbury*, I. 67, comp'd with p. 7 and note *b*.

CHAPTER XI.

THE CHURCHES OF THE EXILES, PARTICULARLY THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH AT FRANKFORT, GERMANY.

THERE is another phase of this question of Congregationalism in Mary's reign, which must not be overlooked. I refer to the course adopted by the exiles from England who found refuge on the continent during Mary's reign. We have already seen that several hundred protestants fled from England to Germany, Switzerland, Holland, and elsewhere on the continent, soon after it became evident that there was to be no toleration under Mary's administration. These men, being free to act out their convictions in relation to ecclesiastical matters in those countries where the protestant reformation had been successful, would, of course, shape their church polity and government in accordance with what they thought true and right. And if we can learn what their course was, we may reasonably infer what was the course of those of like spirit who remained in England; for we know that the exiles and their persecuted brethren at home were in constant friendly communication, letters and messengers passing frequently between them.

It is very fortunate for our purpose, that we have

one original and authentic and particular account of some of these exiles, written by one of their own number, at or about the time of the transactions referred to, and published, in defence of some of these same exiles, about seventeen years after the death of Mary, and consequently in the lifetime of many of the actors and sufferers in the scenes related. I refer to the "Brief Discourse of the Troubles begun at Frankfort, in 1554." *

From this narrative we learn, that, after it had pleased the Lord God to take away, for the sins of the English people, that noble prince of famous memory, King Edward VI., and to place Queen Mary in his room, sundry godly men, as well strangers as of the English nation, fled, for the liberty of their conscience, over the seas, some to France, some to Flanders, and some to the high countries of the empire. Among these exiles for conscience' sake, "in the year of our Lord 1554, and the 27th of June, came Edmonde Sutton, William Wil-

* The exact title of this valuable work is: "A Brieff discours off the troubles begonne at Franckford in Germany Anno Domini 1554. Abowte the Booke off common prayer and Ceremonies, and continued by the Englishe men theyre, to thende off Q. Maries Raigne, in the which discours, the gentle reader shall see the very originall and beginninge off all the contention that hathe byn, and what was the cause off the same. Marc. 4. 'For there is nothinge hid that shall not be opened neither is there a secret but that it shall come to light, yff anie mon haue eares to heare, let him heare.' M. D. Lxxv." The author is supposed to have been William Whittingham, a celebrated puritan, who was a chief actor in the scenes described, and was one of the translators of what was known as "the Geneva Bible."

liams, William Whittingham, and Thomas Wood, with their companies, to the citie of Franckford in Germany; the first Englishmen that there arrived to remain and abide." On the very night of their arrival, a French minister, "Maister Valaren Pullan," called on them, and invited them to unite with his congregation in religious worship, the magistrates having kindly appropriated a church to their use. But after consultation, the Englishmen thought best to apply to the magistrates first, for leave to remain in the city, and for permission for their countrymen to join them, who should for like cause with themselves leave England. These requests being granted, by the advice of their French brethren, Whittingham and his companions, on the 8th of July, applied to "Maister John Glawberge, one of the chiefest senators, for a place or churche, wherein they and all their countrymen might have God's word truly preached, and the sacraments sincerely ministered in their natural tongue." Glawberge promised to move the whole senate in favor of the request. This he did; and, on the 14th of the same month, the senate granted them the liberty requested, and assigned to them the use, in common with the French, of the same church, on alternate days during the week, and at such hours on the Sabbath as they could agree on. This was granted with the stipulation that the English should not dissent from the French in doctrines or ceremonies to such an extent as to produce discord among them.

These preliminaries being settled, the English next consulted among themselves what order of service they should use; for the magistrates had told them they were at liberty to adopt any form of worship, etc., to which the French church should not object. The result is thus stated by one of their own number: "At length, the English order was perused, and this by general consent was concluded: that the answering aloud after the minister should not be used, the litany, surplice, and many other things also omitted; for that, in those reformed churches, such things would seem more than strange. It was further agreed upon, that the minister, in place of the English confession, should use another, both of more effect, and also framed according to the state and time. And the same ended, the people to sing a psalm in metre, in a plain tune, as was and is accustomed in the French, Dutch, Italian, Spanish, and Scottish churches; that done, the minister to pray for the assistance of God's Holy Spirit, and so to proceed to the sermon. After the sermon, a general prayer for all estates, and for our country of England, was also devised, and at the end of which prayer was enjoined the Lord's prayer and the rehearsal of the articles of our belief, which ended, the people to sing another psalm, as afore, then the minister, pronouncing this blessing, 'the peace of God,' etc., or some other of like effect, the people to depart. And as touching the ministration of the sacraments, sundry things were also, by com-

mon consent, omitted, as superstitious and superfluous.

"After that the congregation had thus concluded and agreed, and had chosen their minister and deacons, to serve for a time; they entered their church, the 29th of the same month [July, 1554]. And for that it was thought the church could not long continue in good order without discipline, there was also a brief form devised, declaring the necessity, the causes, and the order thereof, whereunto all those that were present subscribed, showing thereby that they were ready and willing to submit themselves to the same, according to the rule prescribed in God's holy word; at which time it was determined by the congregation that all such as should come after should do the like, before they were admitted as members of that church."

Having thus set their house in order, the church, perhaps unwisely, thought good to try to gather all the exiles into one body at Frankfort; and so proceeded to advertise their countrymen and brethren in exile of their good fortune and comfortable position in Frankfort, "the like whereof could nowhere else as yet be obtained; and to persuade them (all worldly respects put apart) to repair thither, that they might all together, with one mouth and one heart, both lament their former wickedness, and also be thankful to their merciful Father, that had given them such a church in a strange land, wherein they might hear God's word truly preached, the sacraments rightly ministered, and

discipline used, which in their own country could never be obtained."* Accordingly, on the 2d of August, letters were despatched from the congregation at Frankfort to the English exiles in Zurich, Strasburg, Doesbury, Embden, and Wesel, inviting, and even urging their brethren then residing in those cities to come at once to Frankfort, and not only enjoy "the sweete allurements" of the word of God preached and the sacraments ministered, and discipline used according to God's word, but also to be an example to others, and to stop the mouth of the adversary, who cavilled at their dispersion.

These earnest and affectionate letters to their dispersed brethren, instead of bringing new members and increased strength to the little church at Frankfort, brought disturbance and division; for the learned men in Zurich and Strasburg, on receiving the letter of the church at Frankfort, immediately undertook, by letters and messages, to "set the new church in order" according to another pattern than that already chosen, and to introduce the English Book of Common Prayer. This was no part of the church's request or desire; and several letters passed between the parties, and conferences were held on the subject, and the congregation were greatly troubled. In progress of time the celebrated John Knox visited Frankfort, and was elected one of the ministers of the congrega-

* *Brief Discourse*, pp. 6–8.

tion. Knox, Whittingham, and some others, apprehending serious trouble among them from this attempt to enforce upon the congregation the use of the English prayer book, took pains to draw out in Latin a description of the book, and sent it to Calvin for his opinion and advice. He replied, among other things to like effect: "As I behave myself gentle and tractable in mean things (as external ceremonies), so do I not always judge it profitable to give place to their foolish stoutness, which will forsake nothing of their old wonted custom. In the liturgy of England, I see that there were many tolerable foolish things; by these words I mean, that there was not that purity which was to be desired. If godly religion had flourished till this day in England, there ought to have been a thing better corrected, and many things clean taken away." But Calvin deprecated all contention on this subject of forms and ceremonies; recommended mutual forbearance, and commended them to the protection and direction of Christ the Lord.*

This letter from Calvin produced considerable effect on the congregation, so that many gave up their efforts to introduce the English prayer book. And after an abortive attempt to get the Geneva form of worship and service introduced, a committee of four — "Master Knox and Master Whittingham, Master Parry and Master Lever" — was raised by the church, to "devise some order, if it

* *Brief Discourse*, pp. 34–36.

might be, to end all strife and contention." The conciliatory course adopted by Knox enabled this committee to devise an order of service which the church appear to have adopted unanimously and cheerfully. For, on the meeting of the committee, we are informed that "first, Master Knox spake to the rest on this wise: 'For so much (saith he) as I perceive that no end of contention is to be hoped for, unless the one part something relent, this will I do for my part, that quietness may ensue.' Whereupon, after some conference, an order was agreed upon; some part taken forth of the English book, and other things put to, as the state of that church required." This order, which was reported February 6th, 1554-5, the committee proposed should continue to the last of April; and if any contention arose in the mean time, that the matter should be referred to "these five notable and learned men, to wit, Calvin, Musculus, Martyr, Bullinger, and Viret. This agreement was put in writing. To that all gave their consent. This day was joyful. Thanks were given to God. Brotherly reconciliation followed; great familiarity used; the former grudges seemed to be forgotten. Yea, the holy communion was upon this happy agreement also ministered." *

This pleasant state of things had continued only a little more than a month, when, on the 13th of

* *Brief Discourse*, pp. 37, 38.

March, 1554-5, Dr. Cox, a learned and distinguished English divine, who had been one of King Edward's tutors, came with others to Frankfort, and began at once to disturb the peace of the church, in order to introduce the English church-service. Whether or not he came for this special purpose, does not appear; but the fact that the doctor left Frankfort soon after he had effectually broken up the order of the church there, and introduced another, certainly suggests that this was his errand to the place.

The author of the "Brief Discourse" tells us, that Dr. Cox "began to break that order which was agreed upon [on the 9th of February] first, in answering aloud after the minister, contrary to the church's determination; and being admonished thereof by the seniors of the congregation, he, with the rest that came with him, made answer, that they would do as they had done in England, and that they would have the face of an English church. And the Sunday following, one of his company, without the consent and knowledge of the congregation, got up suddenly into the pulpit, read the litany, and Dr. Cox with his company answered aloud, whereby the determination of the church was broken."

It being Knox's turn to preach in the afternoon, he sharply reproved the impudent proceedings of the doctor and his party, whereby "a godly agreement" of the congregation "that day was ungodly broken; which thing it became not (as he said)

the proudest of them all to have attempted." He also took occasion to say, that, "forasmuch as in the English book were things both superstitious, unpure, and unperfect, (which he offered to prove before all men,) he would not consent that of that church it should be received; and that in case men would go about to burden that free congregation therewith, so oft as he should come in that place (the text offering occasion) he would not fail to speak against it." *

Knox "was very sharply charged and reproved, as soon as he came out of the pulpit, for his plain speaking," especially "of such as had many livings in England"; for he had particularly condemned the English custom of conferring on one man "three, four, or five benefices, to the great slander of the gospel and defrauding the flock of Christ."

The troublesome question being thus thrust again upon the poor church, they agreed to meet on the Wednesday following "to talk over these things more at large." On the appointed day, the church being assembled, an earnest request was made that Dr. Cox and his company "might be admitted to have voices in the congregation." This request was refused, as improper and unreasonable; until Knox interfered, and made "entreaty that they might have their voices amongst the rest." This being at length consented to, the doctor and his party came in, and, siding with those already inclined to the

* *Brief Discourse*, p. 88.

English book, made a majority, overturned the old order of the church, "forthwith forbade Knox to meddle any more in that congregation," and, in short, took entire possession. This, to be sure, was not all done at once, or without a struggle on the part of Whittingham and his friends, the original founders of the church; and not until Dr. Cox had driven Knox out of Frankfort, by trumping up against him charges of high treason against the emperor, for having, in the beginning of Mary's reign, compared him to Nero, saying he was no less an enemy to Christ than was Nero. Whittingham and his friends proposed to refer these difficulties to an impartial arbitration; but Cox's party refused; and the doctor, with his clerical associates, assembled at his lodgings, to "consult together whom they thought most meet to be bishop, superintendent, or pastor, with the rest of the officers, as seniors, ministers, and deacons, as if there had been neither orders, officers, nor church there before their coming." *

Finding that no satisfaction could be obtained from these intruders, and that they could not live peaceably and comfortably in Frankfort, Whittingham, John Fox, Goodman, Gilby, Thomas Cole, William Kethe, Roger Hart, John Hilton, with certain others, took their departure for Basil and Geneva. Thus, like the camel in the fable, Dr. Cox, with his party, first, by favor of the

* *Brief Discourse*, pp. 47, 55, 56.

occupants, got his nose into the church, then his neck, and finally his whole body; and when the old occupants complained that there was not room for him and them, he coolly replied, "that if they found themselves grieved, they should seek remedy where they thought good";* signifying his intention, and that of his friends, to stay where they were. And they did, to the expulsion of the body of the old church. So much for the troubles of the first English Independent, or Congregational church in Frankfort, Germany.

Prince, in his New England Chronology, in speaking of this church, and others formed elsewhere abroad by the original leaders in this enterprise, says: "I call them all *Independent* churches; for, though their historians give them not this title, yet they were plainly such in reality." † For the same reason I call this church a Congregational church: not because the builders of it thus styled it; not because it was in all respects like a modern Congregationalist church; but because in its organization some of the fundamental principles of this system were recognized — because it was, in point of fact, embryo Congregationalism. The whole history of this Frankfort church justifies this conclusion. They acted as a Congregationalist church would have done in like circumstances. They recognized fully the right of the whole body of the

* *Brief Discourse*, p. 58.

† *N. E. Chron.* p. 287. Boston, 1826. 8vo.

church — or congregation, as the associated believers there are often called — to deliberate, and to decide by a major vote on the order and discipline of the church; they elected their own officers; they determined on the order of public worship; in short, they did all the appropriate ecclesiastical work of a Congregational church. Thus we are told, that, after the exiles had obtained permission to remain in Frankfort, and had secured the use of a house of worship, "they *consulted together* among themselves what order of service they should use. At length, the English order was perused, and this *by general consent* was concluded: that the answering aloud after the minister should not be used, the litany, surplice, and many other things also [be] omitted." And then follows an account of other matters connected with the order of public worship, which were "further *agreed upon*"; and "sundry things touching the ministration of the sacraments," which "were also by *common consent* omitted as superstitious and superfluous."* In the same spirit, were "*chosen their minister and deacons, to serve for a time*"; they thus asserting the right of the church, not only to choose their own officers, but even to limit their continuance in office. Then, as it respected church discipline — a matter almost utterly neglected in the church of England, and with which the people composing that church had absolutely nothing to do — this little company of believers agreed among them-

* See *ante*, pp. 366–69.

selves, that "the church could not long continue in good order without discipline"; and there was, therefore, "a brief form devised, declaring the necessity, the causes, and the order thereof."

They further symbolized with Congregationalists by all subscribing to this discipline, and thus entering into covenant with each other, and "showing thereby that they were ready and willing to submit themselves to the same, according to the rule prescribed in God's holy word." And it was at the same time "determined by the congregation, that all such as should come after should do the like, before they were admitted as members of that church." *

This may be regarded as pretty fair Congregationalism — a full recognition of the right of a single congregation of believers, associated together for the worship of God and the celebration of church ordinances, to adopt its own rules of order and government; to choose its own officers; to discipline its members; and to do all other appropriate business, independently of any other church or ecclesiastical body, or person whatever; always supposing that all these things are done agreeably to apostolic injunction, "decently and in order," and in accordance with the particular instructions of the New Testament, so far as any are given; or in default of these, agreeably to the general spirit of God's holy word. Nothing of this sort did they learn in the Romish church; and very little did they learn in the reformed church of England.

* *Ante*, pp. 366–69.

Something they may have learned from the purer churches of the continent; but their knowledge of ecclesiastical matters must have been derived mainly from the inspired word — those Scriptures which are "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

That this church recognized this great principle of Congregationalism—the supremacy of the Scriptures in relation to matters of order and government — is evident not only from the general tone of their proceedings, but also from particular acknowledgments. Their discipline, as we have seen, was to be in accordance with God's word; and they constantly appealed to this same standard, as that by which they were to measure all rites, ceremonies, and church order. Accordingly, they said to their Zurich friends, who were anxious to have the English Common Prayer Book introduced entire: "As touching the effect of the book, we desire the execution thereof as much as you, (*so far as God's word doth command it,*) but as for the unprofitable ceremonies, as well by his consent, [Mr. Chambers', the messenger sent from Zurich to confer with the church at Frankfort,] are not to be used." * And to the Strasburg delegation the church declared, "that what they could prove of that book *to stand with God's word*, and the coun-

* *Brief Discourse*, p. 21.

try permit, that should be granted them."* And in their supplication to the senate of Frankfort, the church said: "And because we saw that in the prolix and ceremonious book of the church of England be many things (that we may speak no worse of it) not most perfect, it seemed best to reduce it *to the perfect rule of the Scriptures.*" † And in a conference between Whittingham and his friends on the one side, who proposed arbiters, and Dr. Cox and his friends on the other, Whittingham said: "Would to God that not only the difference in those articles, [of the sacraments and predestination,] but also in all others which be of weight and importance, might be decided by the authority of God's word, and arbitrament of godly, learned men." ‡ He also asserted, "that a church well reformed must be builded upon the doctrine of the prophets and apostles; the unity whereof St. Paul comprehendeth in these words: 'One God, one faith, one baptism'; not beggarly ceremonies and obscurations."

The character of the church erected by Whittingham, Goodman, and Knox, in Geneva, and by Fox and others, at Basil, we do not certainly know. Baylies, in his Historical Memoir of Plymouth Colony, says of the Geneva church, that "in its discipline, government, and form of worship [it] is said to have varied but little from that of the Congregational churches of the present day." But he

* *Brief Disc.*, pp. 24, 26. † *Ib.*, p. 41. ‡ *Ib.*, p. 57

does not give his authority for this; and though it is quite likely to be true, I have not been able to find any proof of it, except what the known character of the parties furnishes, and the assertion of Prince, already referred to. It is certainly a fair inference, that men who put themselves to so much inconvenience rather than submit to episcopal forms, rites, and ceremonies, and who avowed such principles as those men did, would, when left to themselves, build a church after a very different pattern from that which had occasioned them so much trouble, and which they regarded as inconsistent with the teachings of the Scriptures. The church in Wesel, Westphalia, which was erected about the same time with the Geneva church, is called "an open church for our English men"; to which the Frankfort church, after the introduction of the prayer book, were afraid many would go.*

A striking illustration of the prevalence of Congregational principles of church order and government among the English protestants is afforded by the subsequent history of the church in Frankfort, after the departure of Whittingham and his associates to Geneva, Basil, and elsewhere. This history is given at considerable length, and with great

* Master Cole, one of Whittingham's friends, who remained at Frankfort after his brethren had left, describing the state of things after their departure, says: "A lucky matter is attained at Wesel in Westphalia, an open churche for oure Englishe men, to whiche, bicause off nighnesse, they feare many will go from hence, but moo wil come owte off Englande to yt." — *Brief Disc.*, pp 59–61.

minuteness, in the "Troubles at Frankfort"; and from it we learn that Dr. Cox remained as pastor of that church but a little while, and Master Robert Horne was chosen to succeed him. It was, however, but a short time before difficulties arose between the pastor and ministers and elders of the church on the one side, and the body of the church on the other, after this wise: a "Master Ashley" had given some offence to Master Horne, the pastor, and to the elders, by speaking "certain words," as they alleged, "tending to the slander of them and their ministry"; and they undertook to discipline him for the same. Ashley objected to the competency of his judges, inasmuch as they were the parties offended; and proposed to refer the case to the whole church. This being refused, he next offered to refer the case to the arbitration of eight or ten upright and disinterested men. This the pastor and elders also refused to do, declaring their purpose to proceed against him, as the appointed governors of the church; and threatening to inform the magistrates against him if he did not submit. Ashley being "a worshipful man," and withal a man of clear head and decided principles, took opportunity to tell "the whole matter to the church, and desired that the church would understand of the whole matter between the pastor and elders as the one party, and himself as the other." The question was then asked, in the name of the whole church, of the pastor and elders, if they were a party against Ashley. They replied, that

they were not; but that he had slandered them all. It was then asked, in the name of the whole church, who were his accusers. To this no answer was given. Ashley was then called on by the church to read his statement of the case. This being done, it was asked of the pastor and elders, if this statement was true. "The pastor answered, in all their names, that they would not answer more largely or any otherwise, to any questions than they had erewhile answered: and so the congregation was dismissed." * Much controversy and repeated meetings followed; the pastor and elders denying the right of the church to meddle with the matter, reluctantly consenting to call church meetings for the purpose, and finally utterly refusing to answer the church, or to be present at the church meetings when the matter was under consideration. Nevertheless, the majority of the church went forward, held a meeting, and "fully decreed," among other things, "that the pastor and elders in such causes as those in which they were an adversary party, were not fit arbiters or judges; but that such causes did appertain and belong either to the knowledge of the congregation, or of such as the congregation would appoint to that purpose." And it was further "decreed, that if the pastor and elders were required to be present at an assembly, and would not come, that the assembly was lawful notwithstanding their absence, and that those things

* *Brief Disc.*, pp. 62-64.

which they decreed should be had and esteemed as a lawful decree."* Thirty-three members of the church, which was "a great deale the bygger parte off the churche," subscribed their names to these ordinances.

At another meeting, "it was affirmed that the church was above the pastor, and not the pastor above the church; and that, therefore, though the pastor departed and pronounced that he brake up the assembly, yet was the assembly which remained and tarried behind [being a majority of the church] a lawful assembly, and had authority to make effectual decrees, by which they might bind all and every member of the church without exception."† Thirty-two names subscribed this decree. The pastor and elders utterly refusing to act in their official capacity, the church proceeded to appoint certain men to "take charge of the church, and for all things to be done in the congregation."

This bitter and most troublesome controversy opened the eyes of the body of the church to the neccssity of revising their articles of discipline, and providing more carefully for such emergencies. And another trouble, which came up in connection with this with the elders, induced the church "to have a deaconship, appointed more uprightly, according to the rule described in the Acts of the Apostles and the example of other godly instituted churches," who should have the care of the treas-

* *Brief Disc.*, pp. 71, 72. † *Ib.*, pp. 77, 78.

ure or common money of the congregation, as well as other temporalities.*

The "New Discipline" of this church is a curious and instructive document, very full and elaborate, containing no less than seventy-three articles. It was first debated, article by article, by a committee of fifteen, chosen for the purpose by the church. It was then read and discussed no less than five times, on different days, before the whole church, and was finally subscribed to on the 30th of March, 1557, by forty-two hands, "which was the greater parte by a great deale off the church; for the whole church at that time present had not above sixty-two." It afterwards received the signatures of thirty-nine others, all men, on the 27th of December, 1557; making a total of eighty-one male subscribers.† An examination of this book of discipline becomes, therefore, very important, in an historical point of view, as an exhibition of the views of church order and government which prevailed among the more earnest protestants of Mary's day.

1. It sets out with the declaration, that "it is most comely and godly that Christian people resort together in place and time, thereunto by common consent appointed, there to hear the pure doctrine of God's word taught, and themselves openly with their presence and voice to declare the consent of their hearts to the same, and to confess with their

* *Brief Disc.*, pp. 83, 84, 88. † *Ib.*, pp. 89-96, 183-85.

mouth agreeably their belief and faith upon God and his holy word, according to the Scriptures."

2. It teaches that "the congregation thus assembled is a particular church, such as may be in divers places of the world very many. And all these particular churches joined together, not in place (for that is not possible) but by the conjunction of true doctrine and faith in the same, do make one whole church in the world."

3. That "the signs and notes of a visible church are these: first, true and godly doctrine; secondly, the right ministration of the sacraments and common prayer; thirdly, honest and holy life, if not in the whole multitude, yet in many of them; fourthly, discipline; that is, the correction of vices. But the two first notes are such as without the which no form of any godly, visible church can possibly be; wherefore they be the principal and chief notes. And therefore we define a particular church visible to be — the congregation of Christian men, whether they be few or many, assembling together in place and time convenient, to hear Christ's true doctrine taught, to use his holy sacraments rightly, and to make their common prayer together; in the which there appeareth a study of honest and godly life, and which hath in it a godly discipline; that is to say — ordinances and decrees ecclesiastical, for the preservation of comely order and for the correction of vices."

4. "The doctrine which we hold and profess in our church is the same that is taught in the

canonical books of the holy Bible. The sum of the whole, as concerning faith, is briefly and truly comprehended in the three creeds: the common creed, commonly called the creed of the Apostles, the Nicene creed, and the creed of Athanasius."

5. "We observe and keep the form and order of the ministration of the sacraments and common prayer, as it is set forth by the authority of the blessed King Edward, of famous memory, in the last book of the English service. Whereof, notwithstanding, in the respect of times and places and other circumstances, certain rites and ceremonies appointed in said book, as things indifferent, may be left out, as we at this present do."

6. Article sixth provides that the time of public worship, etc., shall be by common consent agreed upon.

7. "It is thought expedient for the church at this present, to have two ministers or teachers of the word elected. And that the said two ministers and teachers of the word shall in all things and points be of like authority, and neither of them superior or inferior to other."

8. Defines the duties of these ministers to preach on Wednesday, Thursday, and Sunday, examine the youth in the catechism, minister the sacraments, visit the sick, and bury the dead.

9. Provides for the appointment of helpers of the ministers in reading and expounding the chapters, in catechising, ministering the sacraments, etc.

10–14. Relate to provisions for the careful in-

struction of the youth, servants, and the whole congregation, and particularly the students, in Christian doctrine; and the arrangement and use of a library of the church.

15–31. Are devoted chiefly to the duties and responsibilities of the deacons. After setting forth the duty of the church to provide for the poor, the discipline says: "It appeareth, as well by God's word, as by the examples of churches rightly reformed, that both the keeping and also the distributing of the treasure of the church appertaineth to the deacons, who be necessary ministers in the church of Christ, that without them it cannot well be; for Christ saith, ye shall have always poor men among you. Wherefore we think it expedient for the church that four men of special gravity, authority, and credit in the church, such as of themselves be able to live, and will do this godly office rather for Christ's sake and the love they bear to him and his poor flock, than for any their own necessity or worldly reward, be chosen to be deacons; which four deacons shall have the custody of the treasure and distribution of the same, and other alms of the church to remain in their hands and keeping, in such sort as it shall seem good to the ministers, seniors, and deacons, for the most safety of the said treasure."

The 31st article is very explicit, and indicates beyond a doubt the views of this church respecting the non-clerical character of deacons, as follows: "*Item*, we think it expedient that the said four

deacons be charged neither with the helping of the ministers in the preaching of the word, neither in the catechising of the youth, neither in ministering of sacraments, or saying of common prayer; or specially the visiting of the sick, other than the poor, for the relieving of their necessity, as with things pertaining to the office of deaconship, nor with any other offices other than is expressly declared in God's word appertain to the deacons."

32. Provides that "there be four grave and honest women, either widows, or wives, (such as have need of the help of the church,) appointed and chosen with the consent of their husbands, to keep the poor when they be sick, and to watch with them by course, one after another, and that they have therefore out of the treasure of the church a certain stipend quarterly paid unto them."

Articles 33–38 relate to discipline; for the execution of which "it is agreed, that six men of special gravity, authority, and wisdom, such as the rule of the holy Scriptures doth set forth as much as may be, shall be chosen to be seniors; which six seniors, with the two ministers of the word, shall have the execution of the discipline and government of the church. Provided always, that the said ministers and seniors, severally and jointly, shall have no authority to make any manner of decrees or ordinances to bind the congregation, or any member thereof; but shall execute such ordinances and decrees as shall be made by the congregation and to them delivered."

39. "*Item*, it is agreed that all seniors, deacons,

and all other ministers (whatsoever they be), the two teachers and ministers of the word only excepted, shall, once a year, that is, the first day of March, take an end of their ministry whatsoever it be; and they from that day till a new election be made, which shall be within one fortnight after the said first day of March, (unless some great causes incident do let [hinder] the same,) shall be all private persons, as other members of the congregation, and so continue still, till they be new elected, to the same, or other ministry or office; every one of them yet notwithstanding, in the mean time, from the said first day of March till new ministers be elected, doing the duty and duties to your office belonging."

40–43. Provide that public prayer and fasting precede and accompany all elections of all ministers; "that before the election of ministers, seniors, and deacons, the places of the Scriptures for that purpose most fit be openly read, and a sermon be read upon the same"; that it be by ballot, "every man bringing a little bill rolled up [containing] the names of such persons appointed as they shall think most meet for the office whereunto the election is then made"; and "that imposition of hands with prayer be used at the institution of the said ministers, seniors, and deacons, according to the doctrine and examples of the Scripture."

44–48. "That the ministers and seniors thus elected have now authority, as the principal members of the congregation, to govern the said con-

gregation according to God's word, and the discipline of the church as is aforesaid. And also, to call together and assemble the said congregation, for causes, and at times, as shall to them seem expedient. Provided always, that if any dissension shall happen between the ministers and the seniors, or the more part of them, and the body of the congregation, or the more part of it, and that the said ministers and seniors in such controversy being desired thereto, will not assemble the congregation, that then the congregation may of itself come together, and consult and determine as concerning the said controversy or controversies, and the said assembly to be a lawful congregation; and that which they, the more part of them so assembling, shall judge or decree, the same to be a lawful decree and ordinance of sufficient force to bind the whole congregation and every member of the same."

Then follow sundry provisions for the orderly management of the meetings; and the chapter closes thus: "*Item*, that it shall be lawful that every member of the congregation making protestation of license before [*i. e.* asking liberty to speak] to the ministers, seniors, and the whole congregation, may speak his mind in the congregation, so he speak quietly, and not against God's truth; for, in case he speak ungodly, that then it shall be lawful for the ministers, seniors, or any of them, to command him silence by and by."

49. "First for the avoiding of all heresies and

sects in our churches, every one, as well men as women, which desire to be received, shall make a declaration, or confession of their faith, before the ministers and elders, showing himself fully to consent and agree with the doctrine of the church, and submitting themselves to the discipline of the same, and the same to testify, subscribing thereto, if they can write."

50. Persons of corrupt behavior, or evil opinions in doctrine, not to be received into the congregation or church.

51. "*Item*, that none of the youth be admitted to the communion, till they be able to make a profession of their faith before the whole congregation, and also have an honest testimony of towardness in godly conversation."

52. No notorious offender in doctrine or practice to be admitted to the communion.

The remaining articles, from 53 to 67, both included, relate to "the execution of the discipline and the correction of offences." Most of these are so significant and so important to our purpose, that they must be given somewhat more in detail.

53. "Forasmuch as no church is so perfect but offences may rise, for godly and charitable redressing and reforming of such this order is to be observed: First, if any of the congregation be offensive in manners or doctrine to any of the brethren, so that the offence be private, and not publicly known, there can be no better order devised than that

which Christ himself hath appointed; which is, first, brotherly to admonish him alone. If that do not prevail, to call one or two witnesses; if that also do not profit, then to declare it to the ministers and elders, to whom the congregation hath given authority to take order in such cases according to the discipline of the church."

54. "*Item*, that it may be the better known what is meant by the word discipline or correction of vice, we think there be three degrees of ecclesiastical discipline: the first, that the offender acknowledge his fault, and show himself penitent before the ministers and the seniors; the second, that if he will not so do, as well his original crime, as also his contempt of the ministers and elders who have the authority of the church, be openly declared by one of the ministers, before the whole congregation, and that he therefore make satisfaction, both for his original crime, and also for his contempt of the ministers, before the whole congregation; and that he be not admitted to the communion before he have satisfied. The third, that if he remains still obstinate before the whole congregation, after a time, to him by the whole congregation limited, to repent in, he then shall be openly denounced excommunicate; which excommunication, seeing it is the uttermost penalty of ecclesiastical power, shall not therefore be executed until the matter be heard by the whole church, or such as it shall especially appoint thereunto."

55. "*Item*, if any person shall be a notorious

known offender, so as he is offensive to the whole congregation, then shall the ministers and elders immediately call the offender before them, and travel with him to reduce him to true repentance and satisfying of the congregation. Which, if he obstinately refuse to do, then one of the ministers shall signify his offence and contempt to the whole congregation, desiring them to pray for him, and further to assign him a day to be denounced excommunicate before the congregation; except, in the mean time, the offender submit himself, before the whole congregation, to the order of the discipline."

56–58. Relate to the settlement of civil matters by way of arbitration, rather than by appeals to the magistrates, and urge on the congregation the duty of such settlements.

59. "*Item*, that the ministers and seniors shall have authority to hear and determine, on behalf of the whole church, all offences (determinable by the congregation) committed by any person in the congregation, unless the party called before them have just occasion to take exceptions to the said ministers and seniors, or to appeal from them as not competent judges."

Articles 60–64 regulate the methods of procedure in cases of appeal from the ministers and elders, or a part of them; and provide that the body of the congregation may appoint so many of the congregation as they may judge proper, to sit with the ministers and seniors to hear the case, or

in place of the ministers and seniors, if they are all objected to. And, also, how the ministers and seniors are to proceed if the majority of the congregation are deemed partial judges, in an appeal to the magistrates.

The 62d article reads thus: "If any of the ministers and seniors be suspected, or found parties, or if any appeal be made from them, that such appeal be made to the body of the congregation, the ministers, seniors, and parties excepted; and that the body of the congregation may appoint so many of the congregation to hear and determine the said matter or matters, as it shall seem good to the congregation."

65. "*Item*, that the ministers and seniors, and every of them, be subject to ecclesiastical discipline and correction, as other private members of the church be. And that, in case any person or persons accuse any of the ministers or elders, or the more part of them, or them all, of any crime or crimes, the same order of proceeding in all points be used as it is heretofore particularly expressed in the making of the exception to some, or more part, or all, the said ministers and seniors, as parties or otherwise incompetent arbiters."

Article 66 provides that no accusation shall be admitted against a minister or elder, except by at least two witnesses; and also for the punishment of such as unjustly accuse them.

67. "*Item*, if any controversy be, upon the doubtful meaning of any word or words in the disci-

pline, that first it be referred to the ministers and seniors, and if they cannot agree thereupon, then the thing to be brought and referred to the whole congregation."

Articles 68–73, are not to our purpose. They relate to the cancelling of the old discipline; keeping of church records, of church acts, members, marriages, baptisms, and deaths; to wills, and to the reading of the discipline quarterly before the whole congregation.

I have thus endeavored to give the reader a fair account of this remarkable book of discipline, quoting, verbatim, all the articles which bear on the question of the ecclesiastical character of this large exile church. And what do we here find? Not, certainly, a prelatical church. There is no recognition here of the existence of but one order in the ministry — that of pastor, or minister; there is no mention, even, of a bishop. Not a presbyterian church; for, though the ministers and seniors are intrusted with the general government of the church, they are temporary officers, who are required once a year to lay down their official rank and become private church members, and from whom there is a constant appeal to the body of the church, which claims for itself the ultimate and the absolute power of government and discipline. The church used the Book of Common Prayer — though not without the omission of "certain rites and ceremonies appointed in said book"; otherwise the general order and discipline and worship

of this church is not materially different from what the puritans established in New England, when free to erect their own system.

And let it be borne in mind, that this second Frankfort church was formed by the men who drove off the more rigid independents, who would not consent to the use of the prayer book to even the extent admitted by those who remained.

All these things considered, it cannot reasonably be questioned but that this church was essentially a Congregational church — in what constituted a particular, visible church of Christ — in its mode of admitting and disciplining members — in the fact that it claimed for the whole body of the membership the supreme power under Christ, and to be the ultimate appeal in all cases of doubt, difficulty, or discipline — in that it chose from its own private membership its ministers, elders, and deacons, and, claiming to be above them all, required them to lay down office at the bidding of the church, and subjected them to the discipline of the body of the church as every "other private member" was; and had no other officers and helpers in the church than Congregational churches have had, and chose them and set them apart to their office-work as Congregationalists have been wont to do. All these things go to show that this church at Frankfort was essentially an Independent or Congregational church. This they were from no deliberate design, but simply because, left to themselves, with the New Testament for their guide and the aid of some experi-

ence in ecclesiastical affairs, they came naturally, and almost of necessity, into some such system as would recognize the essential principles of Congregationalism.

And now, from what we know of this church in Frankfort — which was originally far from being specially favorable to our principles — we may safely infer that other English churches in exile, of which we have not so particular an account, were imbued with essentially the same principles; and that the secret churches in England during this same period were generally not less Congregational in their general character.

CHAPTER XII.

ACCESSION OF ELIZABETH, 1558. — PUBLIC ACTS RELATING TO RELIGION. — ROMISH TENDENCIES OF THE QUEEN.

ELIZABETH, the daughter of Henry VIII. and Anne Boleyn, was joyfully proclaimed queen of England on Thursday, November 17th, 1558, "about eleven or twelve o'clock, forenoon." "In the afternoon the bells in all the churches in London rung in token of joy; and at night bonfires were made, and tables set out in the streets, where was plentiful eating and drinking, and making merry. The next day being Friday [a fast day], it was not thought decent to make any public rejoicing, * * * but on the next, viz: Saturday, November 19th, *Te Deum Laudamus* was sung and said in the churches of London. Thus the satisfaction generally conceived by the people for this new queen superseded all outward appearances of sorrow for the loss of the old one."* Elizabeth's accession to the throne was in accordance with the act of succession, 35 Henry VIII. And though Mary's death was concealed for a few hours,† as if to

* *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. p. 1, Introduction.

† Camden's Elizabeth, in *Kennet's Hist. Eng.*, vol. II. p. 869, folio, Lond. 1719.

give her council time for deliberation, no opposition was made to her successor; which is the more remarkable, since the propriety of removing Elizabeth out of the way had been repeatedly considered during her sister's reign.*

Elizabeth was born September 13th or 14th, 1553,† and consequently had passed her twenty-

* *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. sect. 1, p. 4; *Memorials*, vol. III. pt. II. ch. 64, p. 138. See also *Fox's* "Miraculous Preservation of the Lady Elizabeth," III. 792–800; *Sharon Turner's Modern History of England*, vol. II. pp. 435–43.

Dr. John Story, a civilian of considerable distinction, and "one of Queen Mary's trusty commissioners for taking up, imprisoning, and burning the gospellers," in a bold and bitter speech in the house of commons against the act for the uniformity of common prayer, etc., justified his cruelties against the protestants, and said, "'he saw nothing to be ashamed of, nor sorry for; and that it grieved him that they labored only among the young and little twigs, whereas they should have struck at the root!' By which words it was well enough known he meant the queen." — *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 3, p. 115. See "A Declaration of the Life and Death of John Story," *Phœnix Britannicus*, pp. 289–97. *Burnet* says that Gardiner "thought all they did about religion was but half work, unless the Lady Elizabeth were destroyed." — Vol. II. pt. I. bk. III. pp. 576, 727–29. *Fox* tells us that "Ste. Gardiner especially hunted for the life of the Lady Elizabeth." — *Acts and Mons.*, III. 450. See also pp. 33, 794, 797. *Strype* calls Gardiner Elizabeth's "great enemy." — *Memorials*, vol. III. pt. I. ch. 9, p. 131. *Hallam* seems disposed to speak a kind word for Gardiner, who, he says, "had some virtues, and entertained sounder notions of the civil constitution of England than his adversaries. According to Lingard, on the imperial ambassador's authority [Noailles], he saved Elizabeth's life against all the council." — *Constitutional Hist.*, vol. I. pp. 96, 97, note, Lond. 1846; *Lingard*, VII. 165. The most elaborate defence of Gardiner may be found in the *Biographia Britannica*, vol. III. pp. 2089–2129.

† *Strype* says: "Queen Elizabeth was born the 13th or 14th of

fifth birthday when called to the throne. She had, besides mature years to recommend her, a mind quick, acute, and comprehensive, which had been diligently cultivated and disciplined by study.*

September, for so Cranmer wrote to Hawkins." — *Burnet*, vol. III. pt. II. Appendix No. 6, p. 548. Other authorities say, September 7th.

* Dr. Haddon, a contemporaneous writer, praises her "sharpness and judgment," and "strength of reason and understanding"; and says that "she read the holy Scriptures much and often; that she compared the best interpreters together; that she collected everywhere the sentences of the most learned divines; that of herself she excelled in the knowledge of tongues; and that as she was of a prompt and sharp wit, so she added so much wisdom to it as was scarcely credible in that sex." — Reply to Osorius, in *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. II. ch. 37, p. 80.

The famous Greek and Latin scholar, Roger Ascham, was her classical teacher, and in a letter to his friend Sturmius, speaks of the almost incredible rapidity with which she acquired Greek and Latin. — *Ascham's Eng. Works*, p. 337. Lond. 1815. And in a letter to the same correspondent, dated September 14th, 1555, Ascham praises her excellence in the Greek, Latin, Italian, and French languages. He says that in reading Æschines and Demosthenes for the Crown, she, at the first glance, seemed not only to understand the meaning of the language and the force of the oratory, but also the whole cause of contention, the situation of the people, and the manners and customs of the city. And that he himself was one day present at court, when she gave audience, at the same time, to a Spanish, and French, and Swedish ambassador, whom she readily addressed, without hesitation or perturbation, one after another, in Italian, French, and Latin. — *Aschami Epistolæ*, pp. 20, 51, 53, 56. Oxoniæ, ed. 1703.

Giovanni Michele, the Venetian ambassador to England in 1557, speaking of Elizabeth, says: "She is a lady of great elegance, both of body and mind, although her face may rather be called pleasing than beautiful. She is tall and well made; her complexion fine, though rather sallow. Her eyes — but above all

She was mistress of the Latin and Greek languages, and was able to converse in the chief modern languages of the continent — French, Italian, Spanish, German. She was a woman of great energy and firmness, with a will like her father's, strong and imperious, and a temper as violent, which all the trials and dangers of her early life did little to chasten and mellow. Unlike Mary, she was not vindictive. She manifested no disposition to avenge the insults and injuries which she had suffered from her sister's instruments. Even Sir Henry Benefield, who had used her so roughly while in his custody at Woodstock that she apprehended a design to murder her privately, she merely called her "jailor," when he made his court to her after her accession. But Benefield felt the taunt so keenly, though spoken playfully, that he never again appeared at court. All of Mary's bishops, who went to meet Elizabeth at Highgate, immediately on her accession, she treated civilly, except

her hands, which she takes care not to conceal — are of superior beauty." — *Ellis' Orig. Letters*, 2d series, vol. II. p. 237. And even sober, practical Burleigh, in reply to a playful remark of Elizabeth's, which was reported to him — that she would have a battle with his fingers — gallantly retorted: "I have no warrant for my fingers; but her majesty is allowed to say as King David said in the one hundred and forty-fourth Psalm [first verse]: 'Benedictus Dominus meus, qui docet manus meas ad prelium, et digitos meos ad bellum!' * * * If her majesty's hands and fingers were to fight, I durst match her with King Philip, and overmatch him." — *Wright's Orig. Letters*, vol. II. p. 458. Lond. ed. 1838.

Bonner; and that "beast," though imprisoned by her, she did not otherwise harm.*

Elizabeth had outwardly conformed to all the requisitions of the papal hierarchy during her sister's reign — she was ever a dissembler when her interests tempted her; † yet, the fact that her mother had been a cordial friend of the Reformation, and that her own legitimacy had never been acknowledged by the papal church, naturally rendered her sincerity suspected during Mary's reign, and might have cost her life, had not Philip befriended her. This he did, as was generally believed, in the hope of one day finding in her what

* *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. pp. 573, 729, 748; bk. III. pp. 749, 791, 792.

Fox gives some particulars of "the rude and ungentlemanly behavior of Sir Henry Benefield" towards the Lady Elizabeth. — *Acts and Mons.*, III. 796. So does *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. II. p. 729. *Strype* calls him "an austere man." But *Miss Aiken* says: "The instances related of the severity and insolence of Sir Henry Beddingfield [Benefield?] are to be received with more distrust, for it is known from the best authority, that Beddingfield was frequently at the court of Elizabeth, and that she once visited him on a progress." — *Memoirs of the Court of Queen Elizabeth*, vol. I. p. 174, Lond. 1826. And *Lingard* calls Fox's stories about Benefield's treatment of Elizabeth, *slander*. — *Hist. Eng.*, VII. 167, note. It is obvious that if the forgiving character ascribed to Elizabeth was her real character, then the facts adduced by Miss Aiken, and relied on by Lingard as a vindication of Benefield from "the slander of Fox," may prove nothing in Benefield's favor, though much in Elizabeth's.

† *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. sect. 1, pp. 2, 8. "For my part," says *Lloyd*, a panegyrist of Elizabeth, "I don't pretend to deny that she made great use of dissimulation * * * But the question is to know whether, in her circumstances, her dissimulation was blamable." — *State Worthies*, vol. I. p. 849. Lond. 1766.

he had failed to find in her sickly and unattractive sister; or, as is quite as probable, from motives of policy, for, if Elizabeth had been removed, the next heir to the English throne would have been Mary, queen of Scots, who was then married to the dauphin of France. A union of England, Scotland, and France, against Spain, was to be carefully guarded against.*

Elizabeth was environed with difficulties and dangers on her accession to the throne. The country was entangled in a war with Scotland on the one side, and France on the other; the government was owing "an incredible sum of money," and was suffering under "great decays and losses of honor, strength, and treasure," particularly by the recent loss of Calais; and in short, as Lord Keeper Bacon said, in Elizabeth's first parliament, England was "a ragged and torn State by misgovernance." †

* *Burnet* says that "Philip ordered the duke of Feria, whom he had sent over in his name to comfort the late queen in her sickness, to congratulate the new queen, and in secret to propose marriage to her." — Vol. II. pt. I. bk. III. pp. 748–50; *Neal*, I. 139; *Turner's Modern Hist. Eng.*, II. 491, 497–; *Biog. Brit.*, art. *Gardiner*, vol. III. p. 2115, note DD.

Though Elizabeth refused King Philip's hand, she freely and repeatedly acknowledged her obligations to him. In a public "Declaration touching the Slanders published of Her Majesty," dated October 1st, 1585, she says: "Touching our ingratitude towards the king of Spain, we do most willingly acknowledge that we were beholden to him in the time of our late sister, which we then did acknowledge very thankfully, and have sought many ways since, in like sort, to requite, as in our former declaration by our actions may appear * * *" — *Phœnix Britannicus*, p. 308.

† *D'Ewes' Journals of all the Parliaments during the Reign of Queen*

The people were also irreconcilably divided on religion. A large and influential portion were zealous protestants, exasperated to madness by the merciless persecutions of Mary; while all the offices of trust and influence in the kingdom were filled by zealous papists, backed by a strong body of people who were devoted to the old religion. The queen herself was a protestant, in policy at least, and was expected to become the defence of the reformed religion. But while all popedom watched every movement, ready to work her ruin if she turned against their gods, it became her to move cautiously. And this she did, and so cautiously that for a long time it was not easy to discern whither she was tending. She retained, for official advisers, thirteen out of thirty-five of her sister's old popish councillors, and added to them eight protestants. Among the latter was Sir William Cecil, afterwards Lord Burleigh, who had been her brother Edward's secretary, and was esteemed "a person of rare and uncommon abilities." * He was made secretary of state. Sir Nicholas Bacon, a learned lawyer, shrewd and cautious, was made lord keeper of the great seal. In addition to her council of state, the queen early selected a sort of private cabinet council, consisting of a few prominent protestants of rank and influence, whose attention was directed especially to

Elizabeth, pp. 13, 14, folio, Lond. 1682; *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. sect. 1, p. 8.

* Camden, in *Kennet's Hist. Eng.*, II. 369.

measures for restoring the Reformation, but with great precaution and gradual advances.*

For "a full month or more after the death of Mary," Camden says, everything in the church remained unaltered. And even as late as the last of February, or the first of March, when Jewel arrived in England, he complained that the Roman pontiff was not yet cast out, and that no part of

* *Collier's Ecc. Hist.*, VI. 185; *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 2, p. 74; *Dodd's Ch. Hist.*, vol. II. pp. 122, 123, and notes, Lond. 1889. *Lingard* (VII. 252) says of the council of state: "This council was rather for show than real use. There was another and secret cabinet, consisting of Cecil and his particular friends, who possessed the ear of the queen, and controlled through her every department of state." *Burnet* calls Cecil "the wisest statesman of that age, and perhaps of any other." — Vol. II. pt. I. Preface. But Mr. *Motley* speaks of him rather contemptuously. He describes his course towards the Netherlands as "shrinking and shivering," "rarely decided and never lucid," "deeply pondering and painfully balancing," "puzzled himself and still more puzzling to others," etc. — *United Netherlands*, vol. I. pp. 87, 88, 303. N. Y., 1861. *Lingard*, of course, speaks ill of Cecil, accusing him of "feigning an attachment to the Catholic faith, to worm himself into the good graces of Mary. But that queen already doubted his sincerity." — Vol. VII. p. 251. *Dodd*, another Romish historian, calls Cecil "a man of singular craft and zeal." — Vol. II. p. 134. The curious reader will find a very complete vindication of Elizabeth's favorite man of council and business in the *Compleat Statesman*, pp. 1–49, in *Peck's Desiderata Curiosa*, lib. I.

Camden says of Cecil: "He had few or no superiors as to the several qualifications of probity and prudence, industry, temperance, and justice. He had, besides these accomplishments, an easy and flowing eloquence." — *Kennet's Eng.*, II. 609. And of Bacon he says he was "a man exceeding gross-bodied [he became very corpulent in his old age], sharp-witted, of singular wisdom, rare eloquence, excellent memory, and the life as it were of the privy council." — *Kennet, ut sup.* p. 464.

religion was yet restored; that the country was everywhere desecrated with the mass; and that the pomp and insolence of the bishops was unabated.* Many prisoners for religion had, indeed, been released, and the returned protestant exiles had been well received; † one of the leading protestants, Dr. Bill, had been invited to preach at St. Paul's; and Christopherson, bishop of Chichester, had been imprisoned for his violent harangue against the new

* *Zurich Letters*, 1st series, No. 4; *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 1, p. 54.

† *Camden*, vol. II. p. 377; *Strype, ut sup.* pp. 74, 165, and pt. II. App. iv. *Fuller* says: "For the first six weeks the queen and her wise council suffered matters to stand in their former state, without the least change; as yet not altering, but consulting what should be altered." — *Ch. Hist.*, vol. IV. bk. IX. p. 259, Oxford, 1845; *Zurich Letters*, 1st series, No. 3. Jewel's letter bears date, London, March 20th, 1558-59; and he says he arrived in London on the fifty-seventh day after leaving Zurich.

Burnet (vol. III. pt. III. bk. VI. p. 519) says that "the queen's inclinations to the Reformation were universally relied on. The news of the queen's coming to the crown no sooner reached Zurich than all those who had retired thither resolved to return to England. Horn and Sandys went first to England." They left Strasburg, December 21st, and probably reached London early in January. Jewel, who was following them, writes from Strasburg, on the 26th of January, 1558-59, to Peter Martyr, that "their return was very acceptable to the queen, and she has openly declared her satisfaction." — *Zurich Letters, ut sup.* *Strype* says: "One of her earliest actions was, to release the captives, and to restore liberty to the freeborn."—*Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. sect. 3, p. 36. Harsnet, in his sermon on the anniversary of the accession, in 1601, calls the day of Elizabeth's accession, "a day shining graciously to many poor prisoners who long had been wearied in cold and heavy irons, and had been bound in the shadow of death." — In *Lathbury's Hist. B. C. P.*, p. 42.

religion on the Sunday following;* but still the popish clergy held their places; not one of the ejected protestants was reinstated; and the Romish service, mass and all, continued to be celebrated as before.

On the 18th of December a slight intimation was given of the temper of the new government, by an order to the inquisitors appointed by Mary in 1556, to extirpate the Lollards ("as the professors of the gospel were called"), to appear before the council and give account of all such matters as had been brought before them; and some time in December, Bonner was called to account for the property which he had "forcibly and injuriously taken possession of," belonging to Bishop Ridley. On the 25th of the same month the queen gave a still more distinct intimation of her religious tendencies, by leaving her chapel, with all her attend-

* "Queen Elizabeth, on the Sunday after her accession [viz: November 20th, 1558], caused the gospel to be preached at the celebrated St. Paul's Cross, which took place to the great joy of the people. But on the following Sunday, the bishop of Chichester, by name Christopherson, and a notorious papist, occupied the same place, and in a sermon, with great vehemence and freedom, (for the papists are always bold enough,) refuted everything that had been said on the Sunday preceding, loudly exclaiming: 'Believe not this new doctrine; it is not the gospel, but a new invention of new men, heretics,'" etc. Christopherson was summoned into the presence of the queen and sent to prison for his impertinence. He died within a month after his sermon was preached, and was buried, with all the popish ceremonies, at Christ's church, London, December 28th. — *Zurich Letters*, 1st series, Nos. 2 and 8.

ants, just as mass was about to be celebrated.* Two days after this very significant act, she issued a proclamation forbidding the elevation of the host, or, in other words, the worship of the sacramental elements; and also prohibiting all preaching, and the celebration of religious service in any other form than that established by law, except that the litany, the Lord's prayer, the ten commandments, and the apostles' creed should be recited in English, and "the epistle and gospel at the time

* *Ellis' Orig. Letters*, 2d series, vol. II. p. 262; *Wright's Queen Elizabeth and Times*, vol. I. p. 8. "Oglethorpe, bishop of Carlisle, preparing to say mass in the royal chapel on Christmas day, received an order not to elevate the host in the royal presence. He replied that his life was the queen's, but his conscience was his own; on which Elizabeth, rising immediately after the gospel, retired with her attendants. * * * It was at the offertory, not at the elevation, that she withdrew." — *Lingard's Hist. Eng.*, VII. 255.

The following contemporaneous account of this first important step, indicative of Elizabeth's views on ecclesiastical affairs, is found in a letter of Sir Wm. Fitzwilliam to Mr. More, high sheriff of Surrey, written probably December 26th, 1558: "This nyght I came home late ffrom Londyn: and ffor newes you shall ondyrstande, that yestyrdaye, beyng Crystemas day, the Quene's Majestie repayryed to hyr great Closet, wyth hyr nobles and ladyes, as hath been accustomyd in shuche hyghe ffeasts: and she parsewyng a Bysshope preparying hym selfe to masse, all in the olde ffowrme, she tarryyd there ontyll the Gospelle was done: and when all the people lokyd for hyr to have offryde, accordyng [to] the olde ffacyon, She, with hyr nobles, returnyd agayn ffrom the Closet and the mase onto hyr Priveye Chamber, which was strange onto dyvers * * *" — In *Ellis* and *Wright, ut sup.* There are some slight differences between the versions of Ellis and of Wright, but chiefly in spelling, which is abominable in either.

of the high mass," which the queen continued to attend for a month, forbidding only the elevation of the host.* This proclamation was probably called forth by the disputes which had sprung up between the papist and protestant preachers, and the general disturbance of the public tranquillity thereby. The protestant preachers, immediately on the queen's accession, began to preach, and to celebrate divine worship after the order of Edward's service book; and, not content with this, many of them, "without authority, abhorring the superstitions and idolatries remaining in the churches, were guilty of great disorders, in pulling down images and such other relics there." To this the papists offered the most violent opposition. They "spared not for lewd words, poured out against the queen, without measure or modesty. And both took their occasion to speak freely their minds in the pulpits." † Among others, White preached, December 13th, "a most furious and tur-

* *Camden*, II. 377; *Strype*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 2, p. 77. "The litany was used on the first of January, 1558-9. An edition, on a single sheet, was printed in 1558, containing the clause against the bishop of Rome. A question naturally arises: Was this edition used in the queen's chapel? Either this edition, or the litany in King Edward's book, must have been used; in both the petition is found. In 1559, it [the litany] was again put forth in a separate form, but without the petition in question. That of 1558 agrees with the litany in the ordinal of 1549, in having the words, 'Pitifully behold the dolours of our heart.'" — *Lathbury*, p. 43, note.

† *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 1, pp. 58–60.

bulent discourse at the funeral of Mary, [from Ecclesiastes iv. 2,] in which he declared, that everything was to be attempted rather than that any alteration should be made in religion, and that it would be a meritorious act for any one to kill the exiles on their return." * Jewel writes to Peter Martyr, from Strasburg, January 26th, 1558-9: "The queen has forbidden any person, whether papist or gospeller, to preach the word to the people. Some think the reason of this to be, that there was at that time only one minister of the word in London, namely, Bentham, whereas the number of papists was very considerable; others think that it is owing to the circumstance that having heard only one public discourse of Bentham's, the people began to dispute among themselves about ceremonies, some declaring for Geneva and some for Frankfort." † The proclamation forbidding all preaching, like many of Henry's edicts, was two-edged, and hurt both parties. The protestants disregarded it, continuing their meetings, though with more caution, often assembling in private houses, but sometimes in churches, where the magistrates were friendly.‡ Many arrests were

* Jewel to Peter Martyr, *Zurich Letters*, 1st series, No. 3; *Strype's Memorials*, vol. III. pt. II. ch. 64, pp. 139–43, where may be found a general account of the sermon and of the pomp of the funeral; and No. 83 of the Catalogue of original papers, pp. 536–52, where may be seen White's sermon entire.

† *Zurich Letters*, 1st series, No. 3.

‡ Thos. Lever, in a letter to Bullinger, dated August 8th, 1559, says: "Some of us preachers, who had returned to England from

made of protestant and popish preachers, chiefly the latter, for their disregard of the queen's proclamation.*

On the 15th of January, 1558-9, Elizabeth was crowned by Dr. Oglethorpe, bishop of Carlisle, who alone of all the bishops would consent to do this work; and even he is said to have regretted the act. The archbishopric of Canterbury was at this time vacant, and a considerable number of other sees were without occupants, the bishops having been carried off by a pestilential sickness, which prevailed during the year 1558.†

Germany, being much affected with these things, and considering that silence imposed for a long and uncertain period was not agreeable to the command and earnest injunction of Paul, to preach the word of God in season and out of season, having been requested to do so, forthwith preached the gospel in certain parish churches, to which a numerous audience eagerly flocked together." — *Zurich Letters*, 2d series, No. 13; *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 1, pp. 58–60.

* *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 1, pp. 60–71.

† *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. chaps. 2, 12, pp. 73, 227; *Camden*, II. 372. "The realm had been extremely visited, in the year foregoing [Elizabeth's accession], with a dangerous and contagious sickness, which took away almost half the bishops, and occasioned such mortality among the rest of the clergy, that a great part of the parochial churches were without incumbents. The rest of the bishops, twelve deans, as many archdeacons, fifteen masters of colleges and halls, fifty prebendaries of cathedral churches, and about eighty beneficed men, were deprived at once for refusing the queen's supremacy." — *Heylyn's Aërius Redivivus*, or the Hist. of the Presbyterians, p. 213, quarto, Lond. 1672. On the 26th of January, 1558-9, Jewel wrote from Strasburg to Peter Martyr: "Christopherson, that brawling bishop of Chichester, is certainly dead; the same is also reported of Watson, bishop of Lincoln;

Elizabeth's first parliament, summoned by writs dated December 1st, met at Westminster, January 23d, 1558-9. But the health of the queen not allowing her to open its sessions in person, as she wished to do, it was prorogued to the 25th, when it was opened with regal pomp.* The protestants, through the interference of the council, as the papists alleged, were in a majority in the house. Lord Keeper Bacon, in his opening speech, said: "The matters and causes whereupon you are to consult are chiefly and principally three points. Of these the first is of well-making of laws for the according and uniting these people of the realm into an uniform order of religion." He then admonished the members "that no contentious, contumelious, nor opprobrious words, as 'heretic,' 'schismatic,' 'papist,' and such like names, being nurses of such seditious factions and sects, be used, but may be banished out of men's mouths, as the causers, continuers, and increasers of displeasure, hate, and malice, and as the utter enemies of all concord and unity, the very marks that you are now come to shoot at." † The first and

which if it be true, there are at this time no less than *fourteen* sees vacant." — *Zurich Letters*, 1st series, No. 8. Anderson, in his *Annals of the English Bible*, (II. 277,) remarks on the brief career of most of Mary's bishops. The bench under Mary contained twenty-seven bishops. By the month in which Mary herself was interred, *nineteen* had died; and in thirteen months after, *six* more followed her to the judgment.

* *D'Ewes' Journals of Parliament*, pp. 9–11; *Journals of the House of Lords*, vol. I. p. 542.

† *D'Ewes' Journals*, pp. 11, 12; *Parl. Hist.*, vol. I. cols. 886–88.

most important act of this parliament was the "Act of Supremacy." It is entitled: "An Act restoring to the Crowne thauncyent Jurisdiction over the State Ecclesiasticall and Spirituall, and abolyshing all Forreine Power, repugnaunt to the same." * This act first revives all the statutes of Henry VIII. against the pope's authority and jurisdiction in the realm, and confers on Elizabeth and her successors all the sovereignty, ecclesiastical and spiritual, exercised by Henry VIII. It revives, also, the statute of 1 Edward VI. ch. 1, against irreverent speaking of the sacrament of the altar, and provides for the receiving thereof under both kinds. It repeals the act and statute of 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, which revived the statutes of 5 Richard II., 2 Henry IV., and 2 Henry V., against heresies — declaring such acts and statutes "utterly repealed, voide, and of none effecte, to all intentes and purposes." It provides that all foreign spiritual jurisdiction in the realm be abolished and extinguished; and "all such jurisdictions, privileges, superiorities, preëminences spiritual and ecclesiastical, as hath been before exercised or used for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state or persons, and for reformation, order, and correction of the same, and of all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, shall forever be united and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm." Also, that the queen and her successors "shall have full power and author-

* *Statutes of the Realm*, 1 Elizabeth, ch. 1.

ity, by virtue of this act, by letters patent under the great seal of England, to assign, name, and authorize, when, as often as your majesty or your heirs or successors shall think meet and convenient, and for such and so long as shall please your highness, your heirs or successors, to exercise, use, occupy, and execute under your highness, your heirs or successors, all manner of jurisdictions, privileges, and preëminences in anywise touching or concerning any spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction within these your realms. And to visit, reform, redress, order, correct, and amend all such errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities whatsoever, which by any manner spiritual or ecclesiastical power, authority, or jurisdiction, can or may lawfully be reformed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained, or amended."

It was this clause which furnished the foundation on which was reared those inquisitorial boards of High Commissioners which were the tormentors and executioners of good men for successive generations.

This important act of supremacy further provides that all archbishops, bishops, and judges, and all ministers and officers, spiritual and temporal, and every person having her highness' fee or wages, shall make and receive an oath upon the evangelist according to the tenor and effect hereafter following, that is to say: "I, A B, do utterly testify and declare in my conscience, that the queen's highness is the only supreme governor of this

realm and of all other her highness' dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes, as temporal, and that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, preëminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm; and therefore I do utterly renounce and forsake all foreign jurisdictions, powers, superiorities, and authorities; and do promise that from henceforth I shall bear faith and true allegiance to the queen's highness, her heirs and lawful successors, and to my power shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, preëminences, privileges, and authorities, granted or belonging to the queen's highness, her heirs and successors, or united or annexed to the imperial crown of this realm: So help me God, and by the contents of this book."

A refusal to take this oath exposed one to loss of promotion and office during his life, and disabled him forever from holding any office. Every person using livery, or doing homage to the crown, and every person taking orders or degrees in the universities, was also required to take this oath.

This statute also provides, that, if any person shall, by writing, printing, teaching, preaching, express words, or deed, or act, advisedly, maliciously, and directly affirm, hold, stand with, set forth, maintain, or defend the authority, preëminence, power, or jurisdiction, spiritual or ecclesiastical, of any foreign prince, prelate, person, state, or potentate whatsoever, heretofore claimed, used, or usurped

within this realm, or any dominion of her majesty, every such person and persons, their abettors, aiders, procurers, and counsellors, being thereof lawfully convicted, for his first offence shall forfeit and lose to the crown all his goods and chattels as well real as personal; if he is not worth twenty pounds, then, besides the forfeiture of all he has, he shall suffer imprisonment one whole year without bail or mainprise. The benefices and other ecclesiastical promotions and dignities of every spiritual person thus offending, after conviction and attainder, were made as utterly void, to all intents and purposes, as though the incumbent thereof were dead. For the second offence, the convicted person incurred the dangers, penalties, and forfeitures ordained and provided by the statute of Provisors and Præmunire. For the third offence, he was liable to the pains and penalties, forfeitures and losses, as in case of high treason. It was, however, provided that no person should be punished for teaching, preaching, or words only, unless complained of and convicted within six months after the offence. Ecclesiastical commissioners under this statute could not adjudge any matter to be heresy but such as had been determined to be heresy by authority of the canonical Scriptures, or by the first four general councils, or any other general council wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of the said Scriptures, or such as should be determined to be heresy by parliament, with the assent of the clergy in their

convocation. Offences under this act had proved by two sufficient witnesses at lea were to be brought face to face before the a if he required it, and testify there what the say.*

But this statute went much further th mere letter of it suggests. By reviving statutes of 25 Henry VIII., the titles only o are recited, it gave the queen absolute contr the clergy of the kingdom: no convocation be called without her consent; no canons e by them were of any authority without her bation; and no bishop could be elected v her *congé d'élire* — leave to elect. In fact, s endowed with all the despotic power over the which her father had exercised, and which th had claimed before him.†

* *Statutes*, 1 Elizabeth, ch. 1, sects. 1, 2, 5–12, 14, 15, 1

† The statutes revived by this act were those of 25 Her ch. 19, sects. 1, 2, 3; and ch. 20, sect. 8.

Burnet says: "This act [of supremacy] was in man short of the authority that King Henry had claimed, an verity of the laws he had made." But the only evidenc he adduces are that the title of Supreme Head was left o oath, and that the punishment for denying the supremac fusing the oath was not so severe. — Vol. II. pt. II. bk. II But it is obvious that supreme *governor* is equivalent, in thority implied over the church, to supreme *head*. And l exercised the same authority over the church by her con ers, that Henry did by his vicegerent. The title of "go was less offensive to the papists than that of "head of the c and, as a matter of policy, she adopted that which was le sive to them. And if the penalties for denying the su and refusing the oath of obedience to her ecclesiastical

Another important act passed by this parliament provided for the restoration of the Book of Common Prayer and Order of Divine Service of Edward VI. For this there had been careful, though secret preparation.* A commission of divines and civilians prepared "a book or platform of religion," which was first presented to her majesty, and approved by her, then laid before parliament for approval and sanction. This commission consisted of Drs. Bill, Parker, and May; Mr. Guest, who seems to have taken Parker's place in his absence, and to have had an important part of the work intrusted to him;† Messrs. Cox, Whithead, Grindal, and Pilkerton, returned exiles; and Sir Thomas Smith, "a learned knight and doctor of civil law."

The result of this commission was, that the prayer book of Edward VI., with sundry variations

tions were not quite so severe as those under Henry, the difference was of very little account, as the provisions of this statute and that for uniformity, and the history of her cruelties towards those who resisted her supreme governorship, abundantly prove.

* *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 1, p. 74; *Burnet's Records*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. III. No. 1.

† *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 4, pp. 120–22. Guest seems to have been the most active agent in this work. "Him the secretary [Cecil] required diligently to compare both King Edward's commission books together, and from them to frame a book for the use of the church of England, by correcting and amending, altering and adding, or taking away, according to his judgment and the ancient liturgies." He also prepared a paper vindicating his revision, and containing some suggestions, which was given to Cecil to be submitted to parliament. But Guest's recommendations as to kneeling at the sacrament, and some other particulars, were disregarded.

from the second book, and those rather in favor of popery, was laid before parliament, and a bill was immediately presented and passed, entitled: "An Acte for the Uniformitie of Common Prayoure and Dyvyne Service in the Churches, and the Administration of the Sacramentes." * This act provides for the restoration of the book of common prayer of the 5 and 6 of Edward VI., with the alterations and additions made by this statute, and declares that it "shall stande and bee, from and after the feaste of the natyvitee of Saint John Baptiste, in full force and effecte, according to the tenour and effecte of this statute." And all ministers are required to perform religious service according to this book, "with one alteration or addition, of certain lessons to be used on every Sunday in the year, and the form of the litany altered and corrected, and two sentences only added in the delivery of the sacrament to the communicants, and none other, or otherwise." † Ministers refusing to use

* *Statutes*, 1 Elizabeth, ch. 2.

† The book of common prayer and service actually imposed on the church of England by Elizabeth is not described accurately in this act. Her prayer book differed from Edward's second book in many more particulars than are here enumerated; and her injunctions even contravened her own book; as, for example, in respect to the sacramental bread. Lathbury, in his *History of the Book of Common Prayer*, notices the discrepancy between the act of parliament and Elizabeth's book, and admits that "many other alterations were introduced, and some of them of considerable importance." — P. 44.

See Note B, Appendix, in which these alterations are particularly noted. These are important to an understanding of the con-

this book, or using any other, or preaching in derogation thereof, and lawfully convicted thereof, were to lose and forfeit to the queen's highness, for the first offence, one year's profits of all their benefices, and to suffer six months' imprisonment. For the second offence, they were to suffer one year's imprisonment and deprivation. For the third offence, they were to be deprived and imprisoned for life. If not beneficed clergymen, offenders were to be imprisoned one year for the first offence; and for life for the second offence. For depraving this book, or ridiculing it by interludes, plays, songs, or rhymes, or by other open words, or causing any other form of service to be used in churches, or interrupting any minister, the offender was liable to a fine of one hundred marks (about three hundred and twenty-two dollars) for the first offence; four hundred marks for the second offence; and a forfeiture of goods, and imprisonment for life, for the third offence. This statute further provides, that all persons in the realm, and in all the queen's dominions, shall resort diligently and faithfully to their parish churches, where common prayer and such other lawful service is used, on Sundays and all other holy-days. And that every absentee, without lawful and reasonable excuse, shall for each offence be liable to the censure of the church,

troversies which subsequently arose in the church of England, out of which grew the acknowledged Congregationalism of the kingdom.

and to a fine of twelve pence, to be levied by way of distress on his goods, lands, or tenements.*

Arbitrary and oppressive as these provisions confessedly were, we have not yet seen the worst of this statute. The thirteenth section was, perhaps, that which gave most offence to the puritans. In this the queen is invested with sovereign authority to *order and change the rites and ceremonies*, as well as the ornaments of the church and the ministers. This provision is important enough to be copied entire. It reads thus: "Provided always and be it enacted, that such ornaments of the church and of the ministers thereof shall be retained and be in use as was in the church of England, by authority of parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth, until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the queen's majesty, with the advice of her commissioners, appointed and authorized under the great seal of England, for [ecclesiastical causes], or of the metropolitan of this realm. And also, that

* *Statutes*, 1 Elizabeth, ch. 2, sects. 1, 2, 3. In estimating the severity of these penalties, it must be borne in mind that the value of coin was then about five times greater than at the present time; that is, a pound would buy about five times as much food, or pay for five times as much labor, as it now will. "A great authority writes that fourteen hundred pounds, as late as the reign of Henry VIII., would be equivalent to eight thousand pounds in the reign of Queen Victoria. * * * Prices doubled themselves in Queen Elizabeth's reign." — *Roberts' Social History of England*, p. 194, Lond. 1856; *Strype's Mems.*, vol. II. pt. I. ch. 27, p. 347.

if there shall happen any contempt or irreverence to be used in the ceremonies or rites of the church, by the misusing of the orders appointed in this book, the queen's majesty may, by the like advice of the said commissioners or metropolitan, ordain and publish *such further ceremonies or rites* as may be most for the advancement of God's glory, the edifying of his church, and the due reverence of Christ's holy mysteries and sacraments." *

* *Statutes*, 1 Elizabeth, ch. 2, sect. 13.

Edward's first book, published in the second year of his reign, required that "in the singing or saying of mattens and evensong, baptizing and burying, the minister, in parish churches and chapels annexed to the same, shall use a *surplice*. And in all cathedral churches and colleges, archdeacons, deans, provosts, masters, prebendaries, and fellows being undergraduates, may use in the choir, besides their surplices, such *hoods* as pertain to their several degrees which they have holden in any university within this realm; but, in all other places, every minister shall be at liberty to use any surplice or no."

It further says: "It is also seemly that graduates, when they do preach, should use such hoods as pertaineth to their several degrees. And whenever the bishop shall celebrate the holy communion in the church, or execute any other public ministration, he shall have upon him, besides his *rochet*, a surplice or *alb*, and a *cope* or vestment, and also his *pastoral staff* in his hand, or else borne or holden by his chaplain. Upon the day, and at the time appointed for the holy ministration of the holy communion, the priest that shall execute the holy ministry shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration, that is to say, a *white alb*, plain, with a vestment or *cope*. And when there be many priests or deacons, then so many shall be ready to help the priest in the ministration as shall be requisite. And shall have upon them likewise the vestures appointed for the ministry, that is to say, *albs*, with *tunicles*." The cope, with an *alb*, or surplice, was also to be worn in that portion of the communion service which is used when there is no communion. "As touching kneeling, crossing,

This section places everything, except the polity and doctrine of the church, entirely at the mercy of the queen and her ecclesiastical commissioners. Now, since it was about rites and ceremonies and ornaments alone that there was any dispute among the protestants, and as it was chiefly about these that they and the papists disagreed, for the parliament to ordain a book of service, and to establish rites and ceremonies, and then to give the queen power to alter these at her pleasure, was to make her lady-absolute in the church. This statute allowed her to ordain such "ceremonies and rites" as she and her commissioners pleased, and to compel men to observe them, just as if parliament itself had enacted them. Thus, according to her own words, "The full power, authority, jurisdiction, and supremacy in church causes, which heretofore the popes usurped and took to themselves, is united and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm."* And to this sovereignty she attached so much importance, that it is doubtful whether she would have given her royal assent to this statute, had it not contained this sweeping clause.†

holding up of hands, knocking upon the breast, and other gestures," Edward's book says, "they may be used or left, as any man's devotion serveth, without blame." — *Liturgies of Edward VI.*, p. 157; *Wheatly's Rational Illustration*, p. 100, Oxford, 1819, in *Soames' Eliz. Relig. Hist.*, pp. 26, 27, notes. The above directions about dress, etc., are all left out of Edward's second prayer book.

* *Strype's Whitgift*, I. 495.

† Archbishop Parker, in a letter to Cecil, in 1570, says that in a

The two statutes which have now been particularly described — of supremacy and uniformity — were the great sources of that despotic and tyrannous power which Elizabeth so actively and unmercifully employed against her protestant subjects during her long and eventful reign.

In justice to the queen's first parliament, it should be recorded that these Draconic statutes were not enacted without very considerable delay and opposition. It seems to have been nearly three months from the time that the supremacy bill was first introduced into the house of commons before it was finished and passed upon by both houses; during which time it was under consideration in the commons on no less than thirteen different days; and was read and referred to a committee, "dashed," and redrawn, and read, and reread, passed and sent to the lords, altered and sent back to the commons, altered again and returned to the lords, and finally, after being two months and twenty days boxed about between the two houses, was enacted and made the law of the realm. This long delay and these numerous changes from the original bill are a sufficient proof that parliament was not over ready to pass the bill. The act of uniformity also encountered strong opposition; though it seems to have been

conversation with her majesty she signified, that, if this proviso had not been added to the statute of uniformity, "her highness would not have agreed to divers orders of the book" of common prayer. — *Strype's Parker*, vol. II. p. 84.

more carefully prepared, and to have passed with less delay than the supremacy act.*

Parliament having restored the Reformation, so far as legal acts could do it without the advice or concurrence of the convocation, and having put absolute power into the hands of the queen, to do her sovereign pleasure in the church of England, adjourned, May, 8th, 1559.

Some of the clergy introduced Edward's second book immediately after Mary's death; but the practice was discouraged by Elizabeth, and the Latin mass book was still used, and the priests celebrated divine service for the most part as they had done before Mary's death, with the exception of the portions required to be in English, already mentioned. Elizabeth introduced the new service into her own chapel as early as the 12th of May; and it was introduced into St. Paul's cathedral with considerable pomp, May 15th;† but the old Roman offices were generally continued until June 24th, 1559, when the new book of common prayer became the law of the land by parliamentary enactment. "When that day came, the protestants generally received the book with great joy, finding it to consist of the same divine service with that in

* *Camden*, II. 372; *D'Ewes*, 28, 29, 45, 47, 52, 53, 55, and note to pp. 28, 29 particularly; *Lingard*, VII. 261.

† *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. chaps. 11 and 14, pp. 200, 285; *Strype's Grindal*, pp. 35, 39. *Lathbury* (*Hist. Book of C. P.*) says: "On the 1st of May the book was used in her majesty's chapel, and in all the churches on St. John Baptist's day [June 24th], 1589." — P. 59.

godly Edward's days." * It was, for substance, it is true, "the same divine service" used in Edward's days; and yet there were many alterations from that, and some of considerable importance too; and the book sent forth by the queen, and the one described in the act of parliament, differed so much as to occasion considerable remark and complaint, particularly by the more zealous protestants.†

Some time in June, 1559, the queen instituted her high commissioners' court, agreeably to the act of supremacy, to visit all ecclesiastical persons and places, and reform all abuses, to discharge all prisoners on account of religion, to restore to their benefices all who had been unjustly deprived, and to reinstate the reformed religion throughout the kingdom.‡ She published, at or about the same time, a code of injunctions, for the guidance of the commissioners in their visitations. These injunctions were fifty-three in number; and the first eighteen were, in substance, quite like those issued in the early part of Edward's reign, of which a brief abstract has been given.§ They were, how-

* *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 11, p. 201.

† The variations from Edward's book are sufficiently noted elsewhere. Appendix, Note B. See also *Lathbury*, pp. 43-60, who says: "The puritans in this and the succeeding reign were quite correct in their statements respecting the differences between the two books — the book in use and the book as described by the act."

‡ "This was the first high commission that was given out." — *Burnet*, vol. II. pt. I. bk. III. p. 801.

§ See *ante*, pp. 159-61; *Wilkins' Concilia*, IV. 3-8.

ever, much more extended and minute, and the last half of them, in many particulars, were much less liberal and truly protestant than Edward's injunctions. For example: Edward forbids all processions — "They shall not from henceforth, in any parish church, at any time use any procession about the church, or churchyard, or other place." But Elizabeth makes an exception, that "once in a year, at the time accustomed, the curate and substantial men of the parish walk about the parishes, as they were accustomed" — that is, according to old popish usage. The twenty-ninth injunction was undoubtedly suggested by Elizabeth's antipathy to the marriage of all ecclesiastics; and it throws as many difficulties in the way of such marriages as could well be done without a direct prohibition of them. It provides that no priest or deacon shall marry without the allowance of his bishop and two justices of the peace; and that no bishop shall marry without the allowance of his metropolitan and such commissioners as the queen shall appoint. So in relation to the clerical vestments, these injunctions are less liberal than Edward's. These expressly require all archbishops and bishops, and all who preach or administer the sacraments, or are admitted to any ecclesiastical vocation, or into either of the universities, to wear such garments and square caps as were worn in the reign of Edward. By these injunctions, no person was allowed to be absent from his own parish church, or to resort to another, except to some

parish of the same town, and on extraordinary occasions. No person was allowed to teach school but by permission of the ordinary of the diocese. Three or four persons were to be appointed by the ordinaries in every parish, to see that all the parishioners duly resorted to church, and to report defaulters, after admonition, to the ordinary. Singing men were to be maintained in all collegiate churches. Contentious disputes in regard to religion were forbidden, and the use of opprobrious words, as "papist, papistical, heretic, schismatic, or sacramentary" — offenders to be reported to the ordinary. No book or pamphlet was to be printed or made public without license from the queen, or six of her privy councillors, or her ecclesiastical commissioners, or the archbishop of Canterbury or York, or the bishop of London, the chancellors of both universities, or the bishop and archdeacon of the diocese where the printing was to be done. In the time of reading the litany, and all other collects, and common prayer, it is required that all the people shall devoutly kneel; and when the name of Jesus shall be in any lesson, sermon, or otherways pronounced in the church, due reverence shall be made of all persons, with lowliness of courtesy, and uncovering the heads of the men, as has been heretofore accustomed.* In an addenda to these injunctions, the queen clearly intimated that she cared very little for the enforcement of the order for

* *Wilkins' Concilia*, IV. 8–8; *Neal's Puritans*, I. 186–89.

substituting sacramental tables for popish altars: "Saving for an uniformity, there seemeth no matter of great moment, so that the sacrament be duly reverently ministered." And where the table took the place of the altar, she was willing to have it look as much like the old altar as possible. She therefore directed that "the holy table in every church be decently made and set in the place where the altar stood, and there commonly covered," etc.

Disobedience to any of these injunctions exposed the offender to suspension from office, deprivation, sequestration of the fruits of benefices, and the benefices themselves, and to excommunication, imprisonment, or such other legal punishment as the judgment of the commissioners, or any two of them, might deem proper.

The commissioners began their labors early in July, by tendering the oath of supremacy to the bishops and clergy. Of the *fifteen* bishops then alive, all but Dr. Kitchin, bishop of Landaff, refused the oath, and were deprived of their bishoprics; but out of *nine thousand four hundred* ecclesiastics in the kingdom, not over *two hundred and fifty* refused to renounce the pope, in order to keep their livings.* The great majority of these men were,

* *Strype* tells us, that out of "nine thousand and four hundred ecclesiastical persons, but one hundred and seventy-seven left their livings rather than renounce the pope and change their idolatrous mass for the use of the English liturgy." But in his enumeration of the deprived ecclesiastics, he makes the number one hundred and ninety-two, thus: fourteen bishops, thirteen deans, fourteen archdeacons, fifteen heads of colleges, fifty prebendaries, eighty

undoubtedly, Romanists in their principles, so far as they had any beyond self-interest. If we may believe Sanders ("*mendaciorum pater Sanderus*"), the great calumniator of the protestants of this period — and we may believe him here if anywhere — some of the conforming clergy of this reign read the service and administered the sacrament of the Lord's supper in the churches, and on the same day celebrated mass in private houses; or, to use his own language, often officiated at the Lord's table and the devil's, or at the most holy eucharist and the Calvinistic supper, on one and the same day.*

Another result of the commissioners' visitation was the destruction of many of the monuments of

rectors of churches, six abbots, priors, and abbesses. *Camden* says, eighty rectors, fifty prebendaries, fifteen heads of colleges, twelve archdeacons, twelve deans, six abbots and abbesses, and fourteen bishops refused the oath of supremacy, making a total of one hundred and eighty-nine.—*Hist. Eliz.*, II. 376. *Neal* (I. 192) says: "It appeared that not above two hundred and forty-three clergymen quitted their livings, viz: fourteen bishops, and three bishops elect, one abbot, four priors, one abbess, twelve deans, fourteen archdeacons, sixty canons or prebendaries, one hundred beneficed clergymen, fifteen heads of colleges in Oxford and Cambridge; to which may be added about twenty doctors in several faculties." These foot up two hundred and forty-four. How many of them were "clergymen," does not appear. *Strype's Annals*, vol. II. pt. I. ch. 8, p. 106. *Burnet* follows Camden, or gives precisely the same figures. — *Hist. Ref.*, vol. II. pt. II. bk. III. pp. 796–802.

* *De Schisma Anglicanum*, p. 161, ed. 1585: "Sæpeque et mensæ Domini, ac calicis dæmoniorum, hoc est, sacrosanctæ Eucharistæ, et cœnæ Calvinicæ, uno eodemque die, illo luctuoso tempore, participes fierent."

idolatry in the churches, such as roods — images of Christ on the cross, with Mary and John standing by — images of the apostles and saints, and even popish altar-cloths, copes, books, and banners. These were brought out and burned. And the people, outrunning the commissioners and the wishes of the government, went so far as to take down bells that had been consecrated, and broke up or defaced monuments of the dead, which had emblems of idolatry about them. This provoked the queen, and called forth a proclamation, dated September 19th, 1559, "against breaking or defacing of monuments of antiquity, being set up in churches or other places for memory, and not for superstition," and against taking away bells, lead, etc., from the churches.*

Popish altars and vestments and ceremonies were still retained, and the queen kept a crucifix on her altar in her oratory, and burnt candles before it; and was, in fact, with great difficulty brought to consent to such purgation of the churches as had already been made.

Jewel wrote in February, 1559, that he wished even "the very slightest footsteps of popery might be taken both out of the church and out of the minds of men. But that the queen could, at that time, bear no change in religion ['other than what was already done and established']." Cox, Grindal, Horn, Sandys, Parkhurst, and Bentham, at

* *Strype's Annals*, vol. i. pt. i. ch. 14, p. 279.

that time, essentially agreed with Jewel in the wish for a thorough purification of the churches from all symbols of popery.*

Elizabeth's hierarchy was now speedily completed. Dr. Parker was consecrated archbishop of Canterbury, December 17th, 1559; and soon after, Grindal was consecrated bishop of London; Horn of Winchester; Pilkinton of Durham; Cox of Ely; Sandys of Worcester; Barlow of Chichester; and Scovy of Hereford.

Though the queen had removed the old popish bishops, and filled their places with good protestants, her policy was to make everything as easy and comfortable for the papists as possible, consistent with the maintenance of her absolute supremacy over all. The great body of the inferior clergy — perjured Romanist — were allowed to hold their livings. And though there was a sad deficiency of capable preachers, yet she refused license to all who would not observe all the rites and ceremonies of her hierarchy, and minister in the old popish garments. To supply the deficiency of preachers, the bishops were compelled to license mechanics and husbandmen, unlearned and unqualified, to administer religious rites, and supply the destitute churches with ministers; and this while numbers of faithful and accomplished men were refused, not only all preferment, but even the poor privilege

* *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 18, pp. 262–64.

of preaching gratuitously the gospel to the hungry people, because they could not conscientiously conform to all the requisitions of ecclesiastical law.

The queen's plan seems to have been to keep the new hierarchy so much like the old popish one that ordinary persons should discern no essential difference. And she so far succeeded in this that the people generally attended the parish churches without hesitation, and continued so to do for several years after her accession.* The truth is, Elizabeth was far from being a hearty protestant. She was only a State protestant, while in heart a Church papist. Strype says of her, in 1558: "What to think of the queen at this time, as to her religion, one might hesitate somewhat, who in her sister's reign went to mass and complied outwardly with her practice." "She protested to Count Feria [the Spanish ambassador] that she acknowledged the real presence in the sacrament." Whether she meant the corporal presence does not appear, for the two are often confounded. "The same also she protested to Lord Lamac; and also, that she

* Heylyn quotes Parsons, the Jesuit, as saying that "for twelve years together the court and state was in great quiet, and no question made about religion"; and Brierly, another papist, as acknowledging that "in the beginning of the queen's reign, most part of the catholics for many years did go to the heretical churches and service." — *Hist. Presb.*, p. 226. *Soames* says: "Hardly any of the laity, however notoriously and avowedly partial to Rome, kept away from church during Elizabeth's first five years. * * * It was only something less through another five years." — *Eliz. Hist.*, pp. 10, 12.

did now and then pray to the Virgin Mary." * Camden says of Elizabeth's religious character: "As for the doctrines relating to the cross, the blessed virgin, and the saints, she had very honorable sentiments of them." † Sir Francis Englefield (or Inglefield) one of Mary's chief household officers during Edward's reign, and master of wards after her accession, and one of her grand inquisitorial court, erected in 1556–7, says, that "when she [Elizabeth] was upon other matters sometimes examined by commissioners from the queen, she would herself take occasion to complain that the queen, her sister, should seem to have any doubt of her religion, and would thereupon make protestation, and swear that she was a catholic." ‡

* *Strype*, vol. I. pt. I. sect. 1, pp. 2 and 8, Intr. *Sir Henry Ellis* says: "There can be little doubt that Queen Elizabeth was a believer in a real, but not in a transubstantiated presence." — *Original Letters*, pp. 269, 271, in *Lathbury*, p. 54. *Lathbury* complains that "by the puritans no distinction was made between the corporal presence of the papists and the real presence of the Lutherans. A real, spiritual presence is held by the church of England, in opposition to the popish doctrine of transubstantiation, on the one hand, and the Zuinglian notion of a mere memorial, on the other." — *Hist. B. of C. P.*, p. 53. The puritans were not the only writers who failed to discriminate between a *real*, spiritual, though inexplicable presence of Christ in the consecrated elements, and a corporal presence — a transubstantiation, or a change of the bread and wine into the actual body and blood of Christ. *Burnet* uses the words interchangeably sometimes, speaking of the "real or corporal presence." — *Lathbury*, p. 53, note *h*. *Lathbury* devotes several pages to this matter, which deserve the attention of those who would thoroughly understand this subject. — Pp. 45–58.

† *Life of Elizabeth*, II. 371.

‡ *Pattinson's Jerusalem and Babel*, p. 435, in *Dodd's Ch. Hist.*, II. 119, note.

And Lingard tells us, on the authority of a manuscript Life of the Duchess Feria, that Elizabeth, when urged by Mary on her death-bed to declare her real sentiments on religion, "prayed God that the earth might open and swallow her up alive, if she were not a true Roman Catholic." *

How much of truth there may be in these reports, and how much of sincerity in these protestations of Elizabeth, if really made, it is impossible to decide; for some of them were made under duress, and others for the accomplishment of selfish ends; but this is certain, that her religious character was an impenetrable mist, and her hierarchal establishment was so like the old popish one which it supplanted, that even the most discerning eyes could with difficulty detect the difference. Thus Sir Edward Coke said of Elizabeth's hierarchy: "The review of the common prayer book, the throwing out the petition against the pope in the litany, and restoring some parts of King Edward's first book in the communion office, the decency of the sacerdotal habits, the music and solemnity of the service, reconciled a great part of the catholic laity to our communion." † And Archbishop Parker, in a letter to Lord Burleigh, said: "I have heard say, that when Cardinal Lorrain saw our prayer book in Latin or in French, he

* *Hist. Eng.*, VII. 24. The Count Feria was a Spanish ambassador to Elizabeth's court, and employed in confidential service for his master, Philip.

† In *Collier's Ecc. Hist.*, vol. VI. p. 254.

should answer that he liked well of that order, 'if,' saith he, 'they would go no further.'" * And in a letter to Walsingham, dated May, 1571, in describing a conversation with the French ambassador at the time negotiations were in progress about the queen's marriage with the duke of Anjou, he says, with reference to the English service: "The ambassador himself being appointed to confer with my lord of Leicester and me, made the cause very hard, alleging directly, that Monsieur would never sustain that dishonor, as to come hither with an accompt to the world that he should have no religion; and then I answered, as is contained in the queen's majesty's letters, setting out the nearness of ours to such as was good and sound in the Roman, adding that we omitted nothing but those which were impious and doubtful to be against the Scriptures." † And in "A Summary of Answers made by the Queen's Majesty to the French Ambassador," we read: "If the form of the religion in England were considered by them, it should be found that there is nothing in the same contrary to the Roman religion, differing only, that the same is translated out of the Latin tongue into the English, and some things, for reasonable respects, are omitted." ‡ Heylyn says: "The liturgie of the church had been exceedingly well fitted to their ap-

* *Original Letters*, Parker Society's ed. p. 398.

† Burleigh to Walsingham, in *Digges' Compleat Ambassador*, p. 100. London, 1655.

‡ *Digges*, p. 118.

probation [the papists'] by leaving out an offensive passage against the pope; restoring the old form of words, accustomably used in the participation of the holy sacrament; the total expunging of a rubric, which seemed to make a question of the real presence; the situation of the holy table in the place of the altar; the reverend posture of kneeling at it, or before it, by all communicants; the retaining of so many of the ancient festivals; and finally, by the vestments used by the priest or minister in the ministration. And so long as all things continued in so good a posture, they saw no cause of separating from the rest of their brethren in the acts of worship." * And Elizabeth herself, in a letter to Walsingham, dated May 11th, 1571, said of the English service: "In ours there is no part that hath not been, yea, that is not at this day used in the church of Rome, as of late the same hath been allowed by the last council at Trent." †

* *Hist. Presb.*, p. 224; see also p. 226. See an illustration of the influence of this pompous ritual on a Roman gentleman — "an intelligencer from Rome of good parts and account" — mentioned by Sir Geo. Paule, in his *Life of Whitgift*, pp. 104–6. After witnessing the pomp in which Whitgift celebrated divine service in the cathedral of Canterbury, attended by "a hundred of his own servants, whereof there were forty gentlemen in chains of gold, also by the deans, prebendaries, and preachers, in their surplices and scarlet hoods," and hearing "the solemn music, with the voices, and organs, cornets, and sagbuts, he was overtaken with admiration; and for himself protested, that, unless it were in the pope's chapel, he never saw a more solemn sight, or heard a more heavenly sound."

† *Digges*, p. 98.

So impressed was pope Pius IV. with the congeniality of the queen's temper and hierarchy with his own, that, on the 15th of May, 1560, he addressed a letter "To Our Dearest Daughter in Christ, Elizabeth, Queen of England," in which he exhorted and persuaded his "most dear daughter" to yield obedience to his "paternal and wholesome admonitions. By doing which," he says, "you may promise yourself everything at our hands that you can desire, not only towards the happiness of your soul, but the establishment also of your royal dignity, according to the authority, place, and function intrusted to us by God." * This letter he sent by his nuncio, who was instructed to bring about a harmonious agreement between the queen and the pope. In the prosecution of his mission, the nuncio is understood to have offered, in the pope's name, to confirm the English liturgy, to allow the partaking of the sacrament in both kinds, as it was in Bohemia, nay, and that he would disannul the sentence against the queen's mother's marriage, in case Elizabeth would submit herself and subjects to the pope's authority. The queen refused the tempting offer, but not in a way to discourage further overtures from his holiness; for the very next year Pius wrote another letter, full of love, to her majesty, and started another nuncio for England; but he was stopped by the

* Camden, in *Kennet*, II. 884; *Collier*, VI. 298; *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 69, p. 339–, Oxford, 1824.

queen's command in Flanders.* He nevertheless loitered around for many months, hoping to obtain permission to enter England, through the exertions of the bishop of Aquila, Philip's ambassador, "a clever and crafty old fox, and formed for intrigue," who did his utmost to induce Elizabeth to give the nuncio an audience, but all in vain.†

I have been thus particular with the details of Elizabeth's hierarchal establishment, especially its external conformity to Romish usage and doctrine, because on these points the whole subsequent history of ecclesiastical affairs in England was made to turn. It was the attempt to enforce these Romish practices — these "little things," as the queen and her coadjutors in Church and State called them

* *Camden, ut sup.; Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 69, p. 340.

† *Zurich Letters*, Jewel to Martyr, and Jewel to Bullinger, Nos. 43 and 44. "The pope, both in public and private, is plotting mischief to the utmost of his power. Fourteen months since [this letter is dated February 9th, 1561-62] he sent a nuncio [the abbot of Martinengo] to Queen Elizabeth. But as he cannot yet be admitted into England, he is still loitering in Flanders." Bishop Parkhurst wrote to Bullinger, August 20th, 1562: "After I had written this, too good news was brought me; namely, that the crucifix and candlesticks in the queen's chapel are broken in pieces, and, as some one has brought word, reduced to ashes." — *Zurich Letters*, 1st series, No. 53, p. 122; *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 13, p. 260. April 26th, 1563, Parkhurst wrote again: "I wrote you word that the cross, wax candles, and candlesticks had been removed from the queen's chapel. But they were shortly after brought back again, to the great grief of the godly. The candles were heretofore lighted every day; but now not at all." — *Zurich Letters*, No. 57, p. 129; *Strype, ut sup.*

—that occasioned all the ecclesiastical troubles which followed, and finally rent the protestant church of England in pieces. They were the little wedges, which, one after another, were forced into the rock of protestantism, and which, strong as it was, finally burst it asunder. No one of them alone would have done the work; but all together, perseveringly driven home by a child of Henry VIII., they did all the mischief which followed in subsequent years.

The history of Congregational Dissent in England cannot be understood without a full knowledge of the peculiarities of Elizabeth's hierarchy. It is now, however, time for us to press on rapidly to the results — the workings of this semi-popish system of church order and government.

CHAPTER XIII.

CONFORMITY ENFORCED. — PERSECUTION OF THE PURITANS. — SEPARATISTS' MEETINGS, 1564–1566.

HAVING completed her ecclesiastical establishment, and settled the affairs of State, Elizabeth thought it time to begin the work of subjugating the English people to her sovereign will. She disclaimed any intention to "ransack men's consciences," but avowed her determination to enforce absolute outward conformity. Her bishops were at first averse to severe measures. They had been fellow-sufferers with many of the nonconforming puritans, and were disposed to allow considerable latitude, not only in respect to dress, but also in administering the service of the church. In consequence of this, some of the clergy, for a while, wore the square cap, as prescribed, others the round cap, and others still, hats; some appeared in the habits of scholars, and others without this distinction; some read the service and the prayers in the chancel, others in the body of the church; some officiated in seats, others in the pulpits, with their faces towards the people; some kept close to the rubric, others entertained their people with singing of psalms between the services; and some read with

the surplice on, others without it.* In consequence of this diversity among the clergy, the queen addressed a letter to Archbishop Parker, on the 25th or 28th of January, 1564-65, complaining that "in sundry places of our realm of late, for lack of regard given thereto, in due time, by such superior and principal officers as you are, being the primat, and other the bishops of your province, with sufferance of sundry varieties and novelties, not only in opinions, but in external ceremonies and rites, there is crept and brought into the church an open and manifest disorder, and offence to the godly, wise, and obedient persons, by diversitie of opinions, and specially in the external, decent, and leeful rites and ceremonies to be used in the churches"; and requiring immediate correction at the hands of the archbishop and his fellows.†

Thus called upon, the archbishop began to move; and, two days after the receipt of the queen's letter, issued his orders to the bishop of London, in conformity with the queen's commands; and soon afterwards, with five of his bishops — London, Lincoln, Winchester, Ely, and Rochester — drew up a book of articles for enforcing uniformity, which he afterwards published under the title of "Advertisements," which were sent to Secretary Cecil for the queen's approval.‡

* *Collier*, VI. 384.

† *Strype's Parker*, III. 65-69, App. XXIV.; *Annals*, vol. I. pt. II. ch. 19, p. 126.

‡ *Strype's Parker*, I. 309, and App. XXVI., 315-18; Cardwell, vol. I. No. lxv.; *Neal*, I. 217, 228, note; *Burnet*, vol. III. pt. I. bk. VI. p.

On the 3d of March, four prominent nonconforming London ministers, and two men "of high renown throughout the nation for learning, piety, and zeal for the Reformation, who were exiles for religion in Queen Mary's reign" — Rev. Thomas Sampson, dean of Christ's church, Oxford, and Dr. Lawrence Humphrey, Regius professor of divinity at Oxford and president of Magdalen College — were summoned before the ecclesiastical commissioners. Refusing to wear the habits, Sampson and Humphrey were both detained in London a year or more, and finally ordered into custody, and Sampson was deprived of his deanery.*

Thus was opened anew the controversy about the ecclesiastical habits, and thus began the work of persecution in the protestant church of England for non-conformity to non-essentials; and from this dates the era of PURITAN NONCONFORMITY.

Other clergymen were soon afterwards sum-

588. By these advertisements, all licenses issued previously to March 1st, 1564, were made null and void, and all preachers were required to take out new licenses.

* *Strype's Parker*, I. 319–45, 867–74; *Annals*, vol. I. pt. II. ch. 19, p. 132–. Dr. Sampson afterwards obtained the mastership of the hospital at Leicester, and the prebend of St. Frances in the cathedral of St. Paul's; and after a while, by the favor of the queen, was allowed to be a theological lecturer in Whitington College, London; though he never yielded his opposition to the clerical habits. Humphrey, being a man of conciliatory manners, of learning, and of great purity of character, moderate and conscientious, obtained toleration, and after ten or twelve years, was allowed some preferment in the church, being made dean of Gloucester; and finally was persuaded to wear the habits. — *Hopkins*, I. 234; *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. II. ch. 19, pp. 143–58; *Soames*, 29, 36.

moned before the ecclesiastical commissioners, conferred with, admonished, and threatened. "But the effect did not correspond at all [with the wishes of the commissioners]; but rather what they did proved the occasion to others of becoming more refractory." *

The archbishop was therefore very anxious to get the royal sanction to his "Advertisements," knowing that little could be done without this. He accordingly sent his book to the queen's council a second time for approval, they having declined heretofore to give this, greatly to Parker's vexation. The truth was, that several of Elizabeth's influential, leading councillors were either friendly to the puritans, or inimical to the archbishop, or at least averse to a violent enforcement of merely external rites. Among them was the queen's special favorite, the earl of Leicester; also, Sir Francis Knollys, Lord North, Sir Francis Walsingham, the earls of Bedford and Warwick, and even Cecil, Lord Burleigh, himself.†

* *Strype's Parker*, I. 320; *Annals*, vol. I. pt. II. ch. 41, p. 129.

† *Strype's Whitgift*, I. 308, 425, 597–601; *Neal*, I. 227.

Strype tells us, that when Cecil was urged by Dr. Sampson, in 1573, to recommend to the queen the reformation of the church according to Bucer's "Book of the Kingdom of Christ," and that the people should be gathered into distinct congregations, with resident pastors, and a government such as is prescribed in the gospel, he confessed, "that, for his part, he liked well of his motion, so far as respected the reforming of what was amiss in the church, but that he could not do that good which either he would, or others did think he could." — *Life of Parker*, II. 325, and App. XCIII. *Strype* calls Knollys the puritans' "great instrument." In his report of a conference with Ballard, a Romish priest confined in the Tower, and afterwards executed for plotting the assassina-

Pilkington, bishop of Durham, and Whittingham, dean of Durham, both wrote to Leicester against pressing conformity, and the queen was persuaded to forbear awhile; and nothing of importance seems to have been done for about a year after this first onslaught by the archbishop.* But though persuaded to avoid the odium which would attach to a State persecution of the nonconformists, the queen induced the archbishop to go forward in the wicked work which he had begun, on his own canonical authority, supported by the ecclesiastical, or high commissioners.† The archbishop, though for him-

tion of the queen, Knollys said, that "he obstinately affirmed that he would require no better books to prove the doctrine of popery by, than the archbishop's [Whitgift's] writings against Cartwright, and his injunctions, set forth in her majesty's name." — *Life of Whitgift*, 1. 390, 506; *Neal*, 1. 469. Aylmer, bishop of London, in a letter to Lord Burleigh, dated May, 1579, said: "To be plain with you, my lord, you are the man that do most discourage me. * * * For when such words shall pass from you: 'that such and such things be not of the substance of religion — that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction (which you yourself by statute have confirmed) is mere papal — that you would such and such should preach,' which are disturbers, etc. — it cannot be, my lord, but [that] three words from your mouth, *hujus generis*, shall more embolden them and hinder our labors than our toil and moil shall in many years be able to help and salve." — *Strype's Aylmer*, p. 186. Oxford, 1821.

* In a letter to Cecil, dated March 12th, 1565-66, the archbishop says: "He had made a stop for a while, in urging the clergy's obedience to the queen's commands, upon the political considerations which they who were the secret friends to nonconformity urged. But he did no ways approve of these delays and cold doings." — *Strype's Parker*, 1. 423.

† *Strype's Parker*, 1. 424; *Annals*, vol. 1. pt. 11. ch. 41, pp. 129-31. The high commissions' court, of which we read so much dur-

self quite willing to do the queen's bidding, was much embarrassed by the backwardness of his fellow-bishops and the council; and his most earnest endeavors accomplished but little. This so vexed his lordship, that he finally threatened to abandon the work entirely, if he was not better supported by the court; saying to Cecil, "If you remedy it not by letter, I will no more strive against the stream, fume or chide who will." *

ing this and subsequent reigns, was erected under the act which established the queen's supremacy. By this act, she was authorized to exercise her supremacy in things ecclesiastical by means of commissioners appointed under the great seal. This court, in the zenith of its power (about 1583), consisted of forty-four commissioners, twelve of whom were bishops, many more privy councillors, and the rest clergymen and civilians. This court continued its inquisitorial powers until the 16th of Charles I., 1642. "The germ of the high commission court seems to have been a commission granted by Mary, February, 1557, to certain bishops and others, to inquire after all heresies, punish persons misbehaving at church, and such as refused to come thither. * * But the primary model was the inquisition itself." — *Hallam's Const. Hist.*, vol. I. p. 201, note; also, pp. 200, 516–18. Lond. 1846.

* *Strype's Parker*, I. 318. In one of his letters to Cecil, the archbishop said: "'If the queen would not authorize it [the archbishop's book of articles], the most part [of the orders therein prescribed] were like to lie in the dust, for execution on their parties, laws were so much against their own private doings.' By which words suggesting," says Strype, "that many of the leading clergy (and probably some of the highest order) neglected the enjoined apparel and rites, and so would be very backward to execute and perform the directions of the book, unless the queen's absolute commands were annexed." — *Strype's Parker*, I. 316. The archbishop was particularly troubled with Grindal, bishop of London, "whose temper was naturally mild and averse from rigorous methods." — *Ib.*, pp. 321, 430.

At length the queen was induced to issue her proclamation, which had the force of law, peremptorily requiring uniformity; and the archbishop received her majesty's express commands to proceed resolutely with the London ministers, who were among the most strenuous nonconformists in the kingdom.*

Near the end of March, 1565-66, the London ministers were cited, a second time, before the ecclesiastical commissioners at Lambeth, together with the archbishop's "peculiars" of the city and of Southwark — ecclesiastical officers who were exempt from the jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese, and subject to the archbishop only — to the number of one hundred and forty, "and there they were all peremptorily required to promise and subscribe conformity to the habits prescribed, to the rites of common prayer, the thirty-nine articles, and the queen's injunctions, or be deprived within three months."† The arraigned clergy were not allowed to say one word in argument or defence, or to utter an objection to the requisition; but were ordered to give a categorical answer at once, yea or nay, whether they would or would not conform. Thirty were able to stand in this day of trial, and refuse to conform, and were forthwith suspended; all the others submitted to ecclesiastical authority, though many to the great damage of their consciences, crying out as they left the room:

* *Strype's Parker*, I. 423, 427.

† *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. II. ch. 41, p. 129; *Grindal*, p. 144.

"We are killed! we are killed in the soul of our souls, for this pollution of ours! for that we cannot perform our holy ministry in the singleness of our hearts!" *

His lordship cared very little for the consciences of his clergy. His sole object was to enforce absolute outward conformity; and he immediately went forward with a high hand in his work of persecution. An oath was framed, which all clergymen were required to take before the cure of souls should be granted them, to the effect that they would obey all the queen's injunctions and letters patent, and all the letters from the lords of the privy council, and all the articles and injunctions of the metropolitan, as well as all the articles and mandates of their bishops, archdeacons, chancellors, summoners, receivers, etc., etc.; "and in a word, be subject to the control of all their superiors, with patience." In every parish a board of spies was appointed, to watch the ministers and their parishioners, and be prepared to report to the high commissioners, as often as required, the state of the parish. And to make his work more sure, the archbishop called in all licenses, and required every preacher in the province to take a new license, and promise anew obedience and conformity, and that they would suffer no person to preach in their parishes upon any former license.†

* *Strype's Grindal*, p. 145.

† *Neal*, I. 240; *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. II. ch. 41, pp. 131, 132; *Parker*, I. 431, 432.

Thus effectually was every avenue but one to the pulpits of the parish churches shut up against the puritans. This one open avenue was through the University of Cambridge, which had the right to license twelve ministers yearly, who could go anywhere and preach, without obtaining license from any bishop. This was a sore thing to the archbishop, and he sought earnestly, but in vain, to deprive the university of this time-honored privilege, originally conferred by Pope Alexander VI., and confirmed by letters patent from Elizabeth. The university insisted on retaining and using its chartered right, despite the wrath of the archbishop. By means of this, Cambridge was able, while under puritan influence, to keep a few good men in the Christian ministry, who were not the archbishop's tools, or slaves to ritual conformity. And the university about this time, 1565–67, was deeply imbued with the spirit of puritanism. In Trinity College, all but three of the scholars declared against the surplice; and three hundred of the students of St. John's came to the chapel on a festival occasion without their hoods or surplices, and continued to do so for some time. Other colleges sympathized fully in the hostility to the popish garments. Indeed, so strong was this feeling at Cambridge, that the heads of colleges addressed their chancellor, Cecil, urging indulgence in relation to the matter, assuring him "that a great many persons in the university, of piety and learning, were fully persuaded of the unlawfulness of the habits;

and therefore, if conformity were urged, they would be forced to desert their stations, and thus the university would be stripped of its ornaments."

But this petition found no favor at court; and all the heads of colleges were commanded to assist the vice-chancellor in reducing the refractory scholars to conformity. This was attempted, but was not fully successful until after several years of trial.*

In consequence of the violent measures of the archbishop and the ecclesiastical commissioners, which stopped the labors of many of the best and most active ministers, many London churches were entirely closed, for the supply of protestant preachers at the best was very limited.† The Londoners largely sympathized with the excluded ministers,

* *Strype's Parker*, I. 881–94; *Annals*, vol. I. pt. II. chaps. 43, 48, 57, pp. 152, 217, 372; *Neal*, I. 244.

† *Collier*, VI. 412–19; *Strype's Parker*, I. 427; *Hopkins' Puritans*, vol. I. pp. 236–38. In *Neal*, I. 236–42, may be found the substance of "a paper of reasons against the popish apparel," which contains a summary and very able presentation of the objections of the puritans to the ecclesiastical habits which were imposed on them, and made absolutely necessary to a clerical standing in the church of England.

Six hundred persons are said to have visited a single church in London, on Palm Sunday, to receive the sacrament; but the doors were shut for lack of a minister. — *Strype's Parker*, I. 247–52; *Hopkins*, I. 239. In 1561, there were nine thousand parishes in England, and yet there were but two thousand preachers; and this proportion of preachers to parishes seems not to have increased during the next twenty years. — Strype's Whitgift, in *Soames' Elizabethan Hist.*, p. 82

and refused to hear the archbishop's chaplains who were sent to supply vacant pulpits; and even disturbed them in their services.* Many people would not go to church at all; others followed Coverdale, Sampson, and Lever, who, though they would not wear the ecclesiastical habits, were connived at in their preaching from place to place, which they endeavored to do with as little notoriety and offence as possible.

The pulpits of the established church being thus entirely shut against the nonconforming ministers, they next resorted to the press, and published to the world a treatise, entitled: "A Declaration of the Doings of those Ministers of God's Word and Sacraments in the city of London, which have refused to wear the upper Apparel and ministering Garments of the Pope's Church." This was answered by the archbishop himself, or some of his partisans. The puritans replied, paragraph for paragraph. Several other pamphlets on either side appeared; and the controversy attracted so much popular attention that the archbishop became

* *Strype's Parker*, I. 447–51; *Neal*, I. 228. Whitgift, in his *Defense*, p. 256, says to the puritans: "Some of you have taught, that pollution dothe sticke in the thinges themselves, as that the wearing of them had power to pollute and make unclean the wearers. Else why doe they refuse to come to our churches, our sermons, yea, to keep us companie, or to salute us; why spitte they in our faces, revile us in the streets, and shew such like villanie unto us, and that onely bicause of our apparrell?" — In *Soames*, p. 5; *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. II. ch. 41, p. 126.

alarmed lest the silenced ministers should do, by means of their pens, what he had sought to prevent them from doing by preaching — convert the masses to puritanism. A decree was therefore obtained from the star chamber,* forbidding any person to "print or publish any book against the queen's injunctions, ordinances, or letters patent, set forth or to be set forth, or against the *meaning* of them," under the penalty of a forfeiture of the books, three months' imprisonment, and being deprived of ever practising the art of printing any more. All persons were forbidden to sell, bind, or stitch such books, under penalty of twenty shillings for each book. All suspected places were to be

* *Hopkins* (I. 208, note) gives the following summary account of this famous court: "The star-chamber court was held in Westminster Hall, in a chamber, 'the roof thereof decked with the likeness of stars gilt,' whence its name; or perhaps from the word *starra*, or starrs, the name of contracts in olden times there enrolled. — *Stowe's Survey*, 176, and note.

"This court consisted of the archbishop and other bishops, the lord chancellor or keeper, the privy council, and the judges; all of whom were appointed to their offices by the queen, and held them during her pleasure. Her majesty, when she chose to be present, was *sole judge*. The others could only advise. In her absence, the determination was by a majority, the lord chancellor or keeper having a casting vote. It took cognizance of all sorts of offences, contempts, and disorders, not within the reach of the common law; nor did it govern itself by any statute law, but fined, imprisoned, banished, or inflicted corporal punishment, according to the will of the queen, without limitation. Its determinations were as binding upon the subject as an act of parliament. — *Strype's Whitgift*, 822, folio, Lond. 1718; *Warner*, II. 463; *Hume*, III. 245, and Appendix 3."

searched, and all offensive books and pamphlets seized, and the offenders brought before the ecclesiastical commissioners. And, as a further security, all stationers, booksellers, and merchants trading in books, were required to enter into bonds to observe the premises.*

The press and the pulpit being now both forbidden them, the disfranchised ministers were driven, reluctantly, to consider the question of setting up separate worship among themselves. "At length, after having waited about eight weeks" from the time the London ministers were silenced, "to see if the queen would have compassion on them, several of the deprived ministers had a solemn consultation with their friends, in which, after prayer and serious debate about the lawfulness and necessity of separating from the established church, they came to this agreement: that since they could not have the word of God preached, nor the sacraments administered without idolatrous gear, therefore it was their duty, in their present circumstances, to break off from the public churches, and to assemble as they had opportunity in private houses or elsewhere, to worship God in a manner that might not offend against the light of their consciences." †

This decision was probably reached during the

* *Neal*, I. 248–51; *Strype's Parker*, I. 442.
† *Neal*, I. 252.

summer of 1566, (Neal says, August 6th,) and the nonconforming puritans began immediately to hold separate meetings,* at first very secretly, in private houses, in barns, in the woods, and other retired places in the suburbs of London; thus reënacting the scenes of the old Lollard times, and indeed of apostolic times.†

These separate meetings continued for about a year before they could be detected; the bishops in the mean time trying to reach their invisible opponents by means of printed remonstrances and exhortations. The queen, in a passion at these flagrant violations of her cherished uniformity, issued

* It must be borne in mind that there were now two classes of puritans. *Strype's* description of them, though tinged with his general prejudice against all dissenters, is in the main true. "The refusers of the orders of the church (who by this time were commonly called puritans) were grown now [1566] into two factions. The one was of a more quiet and peaceable demeanor; who indeed would not use the habits, nor subscribe to the ceremonies enjoined, as kneeling at the sacrament, the cross in baptism, the ring in marriage; but held to the communion of the church, and willingly and devoutly joined with the common prayers. But another sort there was, which disliked the whole constitution of the church lately reformed, charging upon it many gross remainders of popery, and that it was still full of corruptions not to be borne with, and antichristian; and especially the habits which the clergy were enjoined to use in their conversation and ministration. Insomuch that these latter separated themselves into private assemblies, meeting together, not in churches, but in private houses, where they had ministers of their own." — *Life of Grindal*, p. 168.

† *Strype's Grindal*, 168–; *Neal*, I. 250–64; *Collier*, VI. 488. See *ante*, vol. I. of this work.

orders to her bishops and high commissioners, to stop these illegal meetings. This, however, was found to be no easy thing; and the meetings continued, until the nonconformists, becoming more bold, ventured into the city and undertook to hold perhaps a somewhat larger meeting than common, in Plumber's Hall, Anchor Lane, June 19th, 1567. Here, about one hundred persons were detected, including four deprived London ministers;* thirty-

* *Peirce*, in his *Vindication of the Dissenters*, (p. 68,) seems to regard this Plumber's Hall congregation as one of the dissenting churches which flourished in London during Mary's reign. And Smith, one of the prisoners examined by Grindal and others, said: "We remembered that there was *a congregation of us* in this city in the days of Queen Mary." — *Brook's Lives of Puritans*, I. 135. And Thomas Lever, in a letter dated London, August 8th, 1559, addressed to Bullinger, refers to the same fact: "When, then, I returned to England * * * I shrunk from seeing masses and follies and abominations of popery everywhere sanctioned by the authority of the laws, and the gospel nowhere to be met with, except among some persons at London, who were admitted to preach before the queen at court on a few stated days, only in the time of Lent, or else in *a congregation that remained in concealment during the whole time of persecution*; and then not venturing forth beyond such private houses as were opened to them, on the cessation of the persecution, they were permitted by Queen Elizabeth in open private houses, but in no public churches." — *Zurich Letters*, 2d series, No. 13.

Brook says that Mr. Evans was "one of the ministers belonging to the congregation of separatists in London in the beginning of the reign of Queen Elizabeth; and as a punishment for his nonconformity, he was sent by the high commissioners into Scotland." He returned in May, 1568, "kept private assemblies with others of his brethren, as he had done before," and on the recommendation of Grindal, was convened before her majesty's council for keeping conventicles. What punishment he received is not

one of whom — twenty-four men and seven women — were arrested and thrown into the Compter prison.* The next day, six or seven of the prisoners were arraigned before Bishop Grindal and other commissioners, for violating the ecclesiastical laws of the land. The commissioners urged on the prisoners, that the gospel was preached in their parish churches, and the sacraments duly administered; and that the ceremonies and habits were indifferent things, which did not touch the essence of the gospel, and which the prince had a right to enjoin for decency and order, and which good subjects were bound to regard. The prisoners admitted that Grindal and some others of the State clergy preached the gospel sincerely; but declared that many other preachers were mass-priests in disguise, some of whom they knew to be bitter persecutors in Queen Mary's time, and had never recanted. They gave the names of some of these preachers; and one of the prisoners said his own parish priest was a papist. Yet these dishonest men, it was urged, were allowed to remain in the

recorded. Mr. Fits was another of the pastors of this separatist congregation, probably after their release from prison. John Bolton was an elder of this congregation. He recanted at Paul's Cross, and for this was reproved by the church, and excluded from their fellowship. In his distress and despair he went and hanged himself. — *Brook's Lives of Puritans*, III. 502–3.

* *Strype* says, "about fourteen or fifteen of the chief of them [were] taken." — *Grindal*, p. 169. *Collier* says, "about fifteen of them were committed." — Vol. VI. p. 433. But we find that thirty-one were discharged from prison at the end of "about a twelvemonth." — *Grindal*, p. 200.

ministry, while godly and faithful ministers, who could not subscribe to the habits and ceremonies, were silenced and driven out of the churches. The prisoners further urged, that the garments were the very same worn by the mass-priests, and, so far as these garments distinguished the wearers from other men, made these men, in the eyes of the people, mass-priests. And yet further, that these garments were manifestly not regarded by the queen and the hierarchy as indifferent, unimportant matters, but as necessary and essential things; because no man was allowed to remain in the ministry who did not rigidly conform to the law which required the use of these priestly garments. The prisoners further declared themselves to be good and loyal subjects of the queen, and disposed to obey all her laws which did not conflict with their consciences; but by the church they had been driven, either to separation, or to sanction the idolatrous gear of the papists.

Failing to convince the prisoners of their error in obeying the dictates of their own consciences, enlightened by God's word, rather than the commands of their prince, the commissioners remanded them to prison in Bridewell; whence, after remaining about a year, they were liberated at the intercession of Grindal, being warned that they would be visited with severe punishments if they repeated their "disorderly and factious meetings."*

* *Strype's Grindal*, pp. 168–77, 200, 226–81; *Collier*, VI. 433; *Neal*, I. 263–67; *Hopkins*, I. 307–17; *Brook's Puritans*, article *Hac-*

After this arrest of the Plumber's Hall assembly, we hear of no other arrests of dissenting congregations for several years. Yet we have intimations that separate meetings were continued, and even enjoyed some sort of toleration so long as Grindal was bishop of London; for he was quite averse to persecuting Christians. Strype, in giving an account of the transactions in 1569, says: "The separatists, who at the beginning of this year had the favor shown them to be set at liberty by the bishop

kins, (vol. I. pp. 188–49,) gives the dialogue between the commissioners and the separatist prisoners, apparently verbatim, from manuscript sources; from which the reader will get a much more correct impression of this examination than from Strype. There is also, in the same, apparently a verbatim report of a subsequent examination of one of the chief of the laymen of this company, William White.

Authorities differ as to the time of their confinement. *Brook* (I. 145) makes it "two years"; *Neal* (I. 267) "above a year"; *Strype* (Grindal, 200) "about a twelvemonth"; *Hopkins* (I. 317) "ten and a half months." The prisoners themselves say, they "were kept in prison *one whole year*." — *Grindal*, p. 226. They were confined, June 19th, 1567. The order for their release was signed by the council, April 28th, 1568. But five days elapsed before they were brought before Grindal again, May 3d; and it may be that some six weeks more elapsed before they were all discharged. Some sort of a subscription was required of them, (*Annals*, vol. II. pt. I. ch. 8, p. 40,) and some of them may have refused to make that, and so were kept longer in prison. Indeed, the Londoners of the party say that they made no promises: "We never yielded to no condition in our coming forth of prison, but minded to stand fast in the same sincerity of the gospel that we did when we were in prison." — *Grindal*, 227. *Brook* may include in his "two years," subsequent imprisonment, which some of this same party endured for their nonconformity. See articles *Hawkins*, *White*, *Bonham*, *Crane*.

[Grindal], did, it seems, continue their former practices, of using private assemblies, and performing religious offices in a way of their own, different from what was allowed and enjoined, notwithstanding the bishop's admonition, and the threatenings of the council. Their chief teachers were Bonham and Crane, who, at these house-meetings, did use to preach and expound the Scriptures, baptize, administer the communion, marry according to the Geneva book," etc.* And in a petition presented to the honorable privy council, in 1569, by "the Londoners of their party, who also had been under confinement at Bridewell, and set at liberty," they say that on their discharge from prison they were given to understand that "we were freed from our parish churches, and that we might hear such preachers whom we liked best of in the city; also, whereas we requested to have baptism truly administered to our children, according to the word and order of the Geneva book, he [Bishop Grindal] said that he would tolerate it, and appoint two or three to do it; immediately after, at our request, he appointed two preachers, Bonham and Crane, under his handwriting, to keep a lecture." † And in his *Annals*, Strype, in giving an account of Sandys' first visitation of his new diocese of London, says, that certain injunctions were given out, one of which read thus: "All clerks' tolerations to be called in." "This,"

* *Strype's Grindal*, 226. † *Ib.*, 226.

he adds, "will be better understood, when we are informed that there had been divers ministers who had private meetings in houses, where they preached, baptized, administered the communion after a new way, different from the public liturgy, and also condemned it and the established government of the church. For which some of them were imprisoned. But such was the clemency of the government of the former bishop, by permission and order of the privy council, [that he] granted them, after about a year's restraint, their liberty; and upon promise of their peaceable behavior, and a certain subscription, allowed them some toleration."*

* *Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. sect. 8, p. 40.

CHAPTER XIV.

TROUBLES IN THE STATE. — THE PAPISTS BUSY. — ATTEMPTS AT CHURCH REFORMATION. — CARTWRIGHT'S VIEWS. — ELIZABETH'S MORALS. — COURT CORRUPTION.

THOUGH Elizabeth's sovereignty in Church and State was now fully established, yet the period between 1566 and 1572 was one of great excitement, and of imminent danger to her government. It was at this time that the league between the chief papal princes of Europe was consummated, if not formed, having for its grand object the dethronement of Elizabeth and all other protestant princes, and the utter extirpation of protestantism. As a preparatory step, Pope Pius V. issued his bull in May, 1566, "to anathematize and confound the heretics, and to sow discord among them." In this bull, he anathematized "all heretics, [and all] living, trading, or travelling, in or among the same, wheresoever dispersed over the face of the whole earth; and further willed, and authorized the wise and learned of his ecclesiastics to labor, endeavor, and contrive all manner of devices to abate, assuage, and confound these heretics. That thereby the heretics might be reclaimed to confess their

errors, and acknowledge the jurisdiction of the see of Rome, or that a total infamy be brought upon them and their posterities, by a perpetual discord and contention among themselves. By which means they might either speedily perish by God's wrath, or continue in eternal difference." *

This bull quickened the papists in the work which Pius IV. (about 1560) and the council of Trent had previously devised to prevent the union of protestants proposed by Calvin.† Popish emissaries soon swarmed over England, in various disguises, secular and ecclesiastical. They even assumed the garb of puritan ministers, and travelled about preaching ultra and extravagant doctrines of any description which they thought adapted to disturb and divide protestants. These popish missionaries were allowed to marry, and to take all necessary oaths, in order to deceive the government; and even to change their names, and to have several different names, the better to accomplish their nefarious purposes.‡ Books, too, against Elizabeth

* *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. II. ch. 48, p. 218.

† *Strype's Parker*, I. 141; *Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 18, p. 341.

‡ *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. II. ch. 48, pp. 218–. The directions furnished these cheats by the council of Trent, were: "That they were not to preach at all after one manner, but to observe the places wherein they came. If Lutherism was prevalent, then to preach Calvinism; if Calvinism, then Lutherism. If they came into England, then either of these, or John Huss' opinions, anabaptism, or any that were contrary to the holy see of Peter; by which their functions would not be suspected, and yet they might still drive on the interest of the mother church; there be-

and her government were freely dispersed abroad;* and popish astrologers and conjurers predicted that strange things were to happen — even the death of the queen and the overthrow of protestantism.†

About 1567–68, the English catholics, who before had been comparatively quiet, and had attended the parish churches, and partaken of the sacrament without much scruple, began, not only to forsake the established worship of the State, but to attend mass, and to celebrate religious services by themselves; while licensed agents of the pope were busy "reconciling" the lapsed penitents back to the bosom of the Romish church.‡

In 1568 or 1569, the famous Douay College was established in Flanders, by William Allen, a Romish priest, and afterwards a cardinal. The design of this establishment — which was the precursor of nearly half a score of similar institutions — was to educate English-born youth to become Romish missionaries and spies in their native land.§

ing, as the council was agreed on, no better way to demolish this church's heresy, than by mixtures of doctrines, and by adding of ceremonies more than were at present permitted." — *Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 19, p. 341; and vol. I. pt. II. chaps. 36, 48, pp. 55, 56, 219.

* *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. II. ch. 46, p. 192.

† *Strype's Parker*, II. 1–5; *Annals*, vol. I. pt. II. ch. 56, p. 354.

‡ *Sanders, De Schisma Angl.*, p. 180; *Hopkins*, I. 336–44; *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. II. ch. 12, pp. 243–; *Life and Times of Sir Christopher Hatton*, by Sir Harris Nicholas, p. 457, London, 1847.

§ *Sanders, De Schisma Angl.*, pp. 178, 179, says that in the course of about fifty years, colleges, similar in character and design to the Douay, were established by the Romanists in Rome, Valladó-

These various popish agencies and exertions conspired to prepare the way for the great rebellion of 1568–69, when thousands of Elizabeth's subjects broke out into open war against the government. In the north of England, the communion table, the English Bible, and the church of England service-book were torn in pieces; mass was openly celebrated before thousands of people in the cathedral of Durham; and nearly six thousand men were mustered in arms, led by the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland. Their avowed

lid, Seville, St. Omers, Madrid, Louvaine, Liege, and Ghent. According to Sanders, Douay and Rome, in the course of a few years, sent over to England no less than *three hundred* missionary spies, to work for Rome. Mr. *Neal* says: "The popish nobility and gentry sent over their children to these colleges for education; and it is incredible what a mass of money was collected in England for their maintenance, by their provincials, sub-provincials, assistants, agents, coadjutors, familiars, etc., out of the estates of such catholics as were possessed of abbey lands; the pope dispensing with their holding them on these considerations." — *Hist. Puritans*, I. 344. The oath taken by every student on his admission to one of these colleges was as follows: "I, A B, considering how great benefits God hath bestowed on me, but then especially when he brought me out of mine own country, so much infected with heresy, and made me a member of the catholic church, as also desiring, with a thankful heart, to improve so great a mercy of God, have resolved to offer myself wholly up to divine service, as much as I may to fulfil the end for which this our college was founded. I promise, therefore, and swear, in the presence of Almighty God, that I am prepared from mine heart, with the assistance of divine grace, in due time to receive holy orders, and to return into England, to convert the souls of my countrymen and kindred, when, and as often, as it may seem good to the superior of my college to command me." — *Fuller's Ch. Hist.*, vol. II. bk. IX. p. 486–91; *Collier's Ecc. Hist. of Great Britain*, VI. 470.

object was to liberate Mary, Queen of Scots, and reëstablish the catholic religion in England.

In 1570, Pope Pius V. publicly excommunicated Elizabeth, "pretended queen of England, and all heretics adhering to her." * Thus everything seemed to be gathering and combining to crush the queen and destroy the protestant religion; and the hearts of all good protestants were ready to faint through fear of what might be coming upon them, from the combination of foreign princes and the machinations of home rebels against the government. Strype calls this "a year of extreme danger and apprehension to the queen and to the whole kingdom."

Yet, during this very time, persecution was kept up by the queen against the puritans, the truest friends of her government and the Reformation, and Bridewell and other prisons were full of them.†

* *Collier*, VI. 466. "More privately sent about 1569." — *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. II. ch. 19, p. 354. "Secretary Cecil drew up a memorial in 1569, on the perils of the kingdom and their remedies. Among the then present perils, he enumerates: 'A conspiration of the pope, King Philip, the French king, and sundry potentates of Italy, to employ all their forces for the subversion of the professors of the gospel. The intention of the same, formed to be extended against England, immediately after the subduing of the prince of Conde and his associates. The discovery of a great number of gentlemen lately in Lancashire, that have upon persuasion forborne to come to the church, with opinion shortly to enjoy the use of the popish religion.'" — *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. II. ch. 54, p. 309.

† *Neal*, I. 270. The Rev. Mr. Axton, minister of Morton-Corbet, in Leicestershire, who was three times, during the year 1570,

The controversy between the churchmen and the puritans began about this time to assume a new phase. In 1570, the Rev. Thomas Cartwright, Lady Margaret professor in Cambridge, had discussed in his lectures questions which affected the very foundations of the English hierarchy. He maintained, for example, that "the names and functions of archbishops and archdeacons ought to be abolished, as having no foundation in Scripture"; that "the offices of the lawful ministers of the church, viz: bishops and deacons, ought to be reduced to the apostolical institution — the bishop to preach the word of God and pray, and deacons

cited into the bishop's court for nonconformity, and finally silenced and driven out of the kingdom, though a learned and faithful minister, doubtless spoke the sentiments of the puritans generally, in one of his examinations. The bishop having said: "You, in refusing the surplice, are disloyal to the queen, and show a contempt for her laws," Axton replied: "You do me great injury in charging me with disloyalty; and especially when you call me and my brethren traitors, and say that we are more troublesome subjects than the papists.

"*Bishop.* — I say still, the papists are afraid to stir, but you are presumptuous, and disquiet the State more than they.

"*Axton.* — If I, or any that fear God, speak the truth, doth this disquiet the State? The papists have for twelve years been plotting treason against the queen and the gospel, and yet this doth not grieve you. But I protest in the presence of God, and of you all, that I am a true and faithful subject to her majesty; also I do pray daily, both publicly and privately, for her majesty's safety, and for her long and prosperous reign, and for the overthrow of all her enemies, and especially the papists. I do profess myself an enemy to her enemies, and a friend to her friends; therefore, if you have any conscience, cease to charge me with disloyalty to my prince." — *Neal*, I. 278, note.

to take care of the poor"; that "the government of the church ought not to be intrusted with archbishops' chancellors, or the officials of archdeacons, but every church should be governed by its own ministers and presbyters"; that "ministers ought not to be at large [*i. e.* ordained without reference to some particular church], but every one should have the charge of a certain flock"; that "nobody should ask or stand as a candidate for the ministry"; that "bishops should not be created by civil authority, but ought to be fairly chosen by the church."*

Cartwright was one of the most learned men of his time, an admired preacher and a popular lecturer. These sentiments, though at first thrown out rather as suggestions with reference to a more perfect form of ecclesiastical government than with any purpose of controversy, yet, falling in with the private convictions of many thinking men among the puritans, produced great excitement, and raised a storm of persecution against the learned professor, which ultimately, in spite of all he or his influential friends could do, drove him from the university, deprived him of his degree of doctor of divinity, removed him from his lectureship and fellowship, and finally compelled him to leave the country. In most particulars, the treat-

* *Neal*, I. 279; *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. II. ch. 57, pp. 379–; *Brook*, II. 140; *Collier*, VI. 473–78. All these authorities vary in the phraseology of Cartwright's propositions, though they agree in substance. I have followed Mr. Neal.

ment of this bold confessor was like that experienced by Wickliffe, who, two hundred years before, promulgated similar sentiments.

Repeated efforts were made by the puritans and their friends, between 1566 and 1572, to get some relief from their burdens from parliament, from the convocation, and the queen. The commons were quite inclined to aid this good work; and bills were several times introduced, "touching reformation of matters of religion," and some brave and bold speeches were made in support of them, by men of standing and influence in parliament. For example, in the parliament of 1571, Mr. Strickland, "a grave and ancient man of great zeal," made a long speech in the house, in which, among other things, he said: "Although the Book of Common Prayer is (God be praised) drawn very near to the sincerity of the truth, yet are there some things inserted more superstitious than in so high matters be tolerable; as, namely, in the administration of the sacrament of baptism, the sign of the cross to be made with some ceremonies, and such other errors, all which might well be changed, without note of chopping or changing of religion, whereby the enemies might slander us. He spake at large of the abuses of the church of England, and of the churchmen; as, first, that known papists are admitted to have ecclesiastical government and great livings; that godly, honest, and learned protestants have little or nothing; that boys are dispensed with, to have spiritual promotions; that, by friend-

ship with the master of the faculties, either unable men are qualified, or some one man allowed to have too many several livings." Mr. Norton, "a man wise, bold, and eloquent, stood up next," and seconded Mr. Strickland; saying, that "he was of Mr. Strickland's mind, chiefly for the avoiding and suppressing of simonical engrossment." *

In accordance with these sentiments, bills were discussed and referred to committees; and three were actually passed and sent up to the lords, notwithstanding her majesty had signified, very distinctly, her disapproval of this meddling with matters which, in her judgment, pertained to her prerogative alone. She, however, succeeded in "dashing" the bills, and they came to nothing.†

The puritans next addressed the convocation. April 3d, 1571, Gilbert Alcock, "an excellent minister of puritan principles, but silenced with many of his brethren for nonconformity, presented a supplication to the convocation, in behalf of himself and his suffering brethren, earnestly soliciting the

* *D'Ewes, Journals of Parliament*, pp. 147, 156; *Strype's Parker*, II. 62, 63; *Annals*, vol. II. pt. I. ch. 7, p. 93.

† *D'Ewes* gives an extended account of these bills, and of the various discussions which they underwent. — *Journals*, pp. 156–58, 160, 180, 182, 184, 185, 213. See also *Hopkins*, I. 379–86. *Strype* (*Annals*, vol. II. pt. II. ch. 7) gives the proceedings of this parliament with reference to these reformatory bills. He says: "There was a strong party in the house that resolved to press as vigorously as might be a further reformation of religion; namely, by altering several things in the common prayer and the ceremonies established." — P. 93.

house to consider their case, and redress their grievances." In this supplication, after alluding to the ceremonies which were urged upon the consciences of Christians, he goes on to say: "If a minister preach true doctrine, and live virtuously, yet omit the least ceremony for conscience sake, he is immediately indicted, deprived, cast into prison, and his goods wasted and destroyed; he is kept from his wife and children, and at last excommunicated, even though the articles brought against him be ever so false. Those who observe your ceremonies, though they be idolaters, common swearers, adulterers, or much worse, live without punishment, and have many friends. We, therefore, beseech your fatherhoods to pity our case, to take these stumbling blocks from us, that we may live quiet and peaceable lives, to the honor of our God." *

But the "fatherhoods," though they could not deny the truth of the good man's declarations, yet cared very little for such trifling matters as men's consciences or church purity; and the burdens of which the puritans complained were not only allowed to remain — the convocation refusing to touch them with one of their fingers — but were actually increased. New canons were passed, forbidding any minister to preach, or even to read the common prayers in a private house, without license; and all bishops were required to call all preachers before them and take away their licenses,

* *Brook's Lives of the Puritans*, I. 170, 171; *Neal*, I. 288.

and then to license anew only those who would promise absolute conformity to all the canons of the convention, and who were in all other respects agreeable to the licensers.*

So tyrannical were these new ecclesiastical injunctions, that Grindal, now archbishop of York, refused to press them in his province. Pilkington, of Durham, and some other bishops, also, were quite unwilling to enforce the new canons; yet, so determined was the queen known to be, that when the elector of the Palatine of the Rhine, touched with the sufferings of the puritan ministers, addressed a letter to the queen, beseeching her not to insist on subscriptions, or upon wearing the habits, even Grindal, to whom the letter was enclosed, dared not deliver it, for fear of the royal displeasure.†

In the parliament of 1572, a further attempt was made to secure some reformation in regard to "rites and ceremonies" in the church. A bill was read the third time on Tuesday, the 20th of May, 1572; but on Thursday, May 22d, the queen's majesty signified that her highness' pleasure was "that from henceforth no bills concerning religion shall be preferred or received into this house unless the same should be first considered and liked by the clergy. And further, that her majesty's pleasure is, to see the two last bills read in this house

* *Sparrow's Collections; Strype's Parker*, II. 51–62; *Hopkins*, I. 405, 406.

† *Neal*, I. 289.

touching rites and ceremonies." The bills were accordingly sent to her, and the house never saw them again.

Parliament, being thus forbidden to proceed in these matters, next resorted to petitions to her majesty. They represented "that for lack of true discipline in the church, great numbers are admitted ministers that are infamous in their lives and conversations; and among those that are of ability, their gifts in many places are useless, by reason of pluralities and non-residency, whereby infinite numbers of your majesty's subjects are like to perish for lack of knowledge," etc.; and humbly prayed for some redress.*

But the queen was as deaf to petitions as she was averse to parliamentary action, and dissolved parliament on the 29th of May, without deigning to notice the prayer of her commons; though not without a severe reprimand to the reformers for "their audacious, arrogant, and presumptuous folly, thus by superfluous speech spending much time in meddling with matters neither pertaining to them, nor within the capacity of their understandings." †

The imperious queen now drove on apace the work of persecution, by means of her willing servant, Archbishop Parker; and every minister who could be reached, was compelled to conform to every iota of her ceremonial laws, or suffer their

* *Neal's Hist. Pur.*, i. 287, 288; *Brook*, i. 81.
† *D'Ewes*, p. 151.

bitter penalties. Yet, after all, it was a work of useless cruelty, so far as the great end contemplated was concerned; for the puritans, instead of being intimidated and driven into conformity, were made by persecution more and more averse to a hierarchal establishment in which external conformity to rites and ceremonies and dress was regarded as more important than honesty, fidelity, learning and piety in a minister. This persecution had also the natural effect of creating sympathy for the sufferers, and multiplying the number of their friends. Thus Strype tells us, that, "notwithstanding the opposition they [the puritans] met with from the queen and her commissioners, by her repeated orders and commands; yet they daily got ground, and increased more and more, being favored and countenanced by many in court and city. They issued out their books in great plenty. The bishops they labored to make odious, and termed them persecutors; and they gave out that what the bishops did was not so much for the church as for securing their own credit. At the council board they had professed friends, such as the Earl of Leicester, Sir Ralph Sadlier, and divers others. Insomuch that the church had but two or three fast friends there, whereof the lord Burleigh, lord treasurer, was the chief." And in a letter to the lord treasurer, written in November, 1572, Archbishop Parker explains, that he and the commissioners had been comparatively quiet of late, because of the strength of public opinion against

them. He says, they knew that the puritans were printing and scattering abroad their books; but their presses, after diligent search, could not be found; and "he understood," he said, "how, throughout all the realm, among such as professed themselves protestants, the matter was taken: they, the puritans, rightly justified, and we judged to be extreme persecutors." He adds, that "the more they [the puritans] writ, the more they shamed our religion; the more they were applauded, the more they were comforted." *

The puritans had at least one steady, consistent, hearty hater, and that was Elizabeth Tudor. She had no personal experience of a scrupulous conscience, and could not understand why others should be troubled in that way. All she asked, all she cared for, was absolute outward conformity to her sovereign will. The faith and morals of the people were of little account. They might think and believe what they would, provided they did not interfere with her sovereignty in Church and State.†

* *Strype's Parker*, II. 191, 192.

† In 1570, the queen directed the lord keeper to declare, in the star chamber, to all her loving subjects, that, "as long as they shall openly continue in the observation of her laws, and shall not wilfully and manifestly break them by their open actions, her majesty's meaning is, not to have any of them molested by any inquisition or examination of their consciences in causes of religion." — *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. II. ch. 57, pp. 371, 372.

Elizabeth did pretend, on one occasion at least — or rather Burleigh did for her — to have conscientious scruples: "Her majesty

The state of morals and religion in the court and country were what might have been expected from the queen's character and conduct. Strype, a willing panegyrist of Elizabeth whenever he could be, draws a picture of the court and country about the year 1572, sombre enough to please Elizabeth's worst enemies. He says: "The state of the church and religion at this time was but low and sadly neglected, occasioned in a great measure by these unhappy controversies about the church's government and other external matters in religion, which so employed the thoughts and zeal of both clergy and laity, that the better and more substantial parts of it were very little regarded. The queen's own court [was] an harbor for epicures and atheists, and a kind of lawless place, because it stood in no parish; which made good men fear some sad judgments impending over the nation." *

The queen herself was far from being a pattern of good works. She had a low opinion of preach-

would have you all understand," said the lord treasurer to the ecclesiastical commissioners, in 1573, "that as she herself cannot be quiet in *her conscience*, without earnest prosecuting the reformation hereof," that is, of those who thought it "a burden of conscience to observe the orders and rites of the church established by law." — *Strype's Parker*, II. 351, 352.

* *Life of Parker*, II. 204.

Mr. *Hopkins* has collected many evidences of Elizabeth's loose notions of the Sabbath. While at Kenilworth, she is said to have attended church in the morning, and recreated herself with "sports and pastimes, as on other days, in the afternoons." — Vol. II. p. 186; vol. III. pp. 586-91; *Strype's Annals*, vol. II. pt. I. ch. 4, p. 58.

ing as a means of improving men, and, it is said, rarely heard a sermon except in Lent, and thought three or four preachers sufficient for a whole county. Her life, too, if not openly licentious, was such as to occasion constant scandal, which was freely circulated, not only through her own kingdom, but in foreign courts. That the many disreputable stories about the queen had something more than the mere malice of her enemies for a foundation, is quite evident from all contemporaneous history. The letters of Sir Christopher Hatton, one of Elizabeth's chief favorites, addressed to the queen, are such as no subject would have dared to write, if he had not been admitted to great familiarities with her. Some of these letters are impassioned love-letters. Leicester, too, wrote about her what no man could have written about a woman of strict propriety of life.*

With a queen whose daily life exposed her to

* *Life and Times of Sir Christopher Hatton*, pp. 4–7, 25, 80; *Lingard's Hist. Eng.*, VIII. 285–88; *Hopkins' Hist. Puritans*, vol. I. chap. IX. entire, and pp. 460–65, note.

"It being now the latter end of January, the archbishop's thoughts were busied about providing preachers before the queen the ensuing Lent; which was the chief, if not the only time in the year of her majesty's hearing sermons, if we may believe a late writer." — *Strype's Parker*, I. 401. The reference here is to *Howell's Familiar Letters*, book IV. letter 12, pp. 462–65. London, 1754. The reader will find there a sad picture of Elizabeth and her court, including even her *maids of honor*. The writer says: "Touching the religion of the court, she seldom came to sermon but in Lent-time; nor did there use to be any sermon upon Sundays, unless there were festivals."

the grossest scandal while claiming to be supreme governor of the church, and a court which was "a harbor for epicures and atheists, and a kind of lawless place," what could be expected but that "the church and religion" of the country should be "low and sadly neglected"?

CHAPTER XV.

FRUITLESS EFFORTS OF THE PURITANS AT CHURCH REFORMATION AND DISCIPLINE. — ARBITRARY ACTS OF THE QUEEN, 1572–1579.

In the spring of 1572, the puritans made another effort to present their cause fairly before the country, and to obtain some reformation in the church and some relief from personal hardships. Two of their number, Rev. Mr. John Field and Rev. Mr. Thomas Wilcox (or Welcocks), drew up "An Admonition to Parliament for Reformation of Church Discipline." * This set forth the chief grievances

* *Strype* says that "several persons had assembled privately together in London (as Dr. Bancroft was informed), namely, Gilby, Sampson, Lever, Field, Wilcox, and some other — Cartwright very likely among the rest; and then it was agreed upon, that an Admonition should be compiled and offered unto the parliament approaching," though, he says, "it never was offered to them." — *Life of Whitgift*, I. 54; *Life of Parker*, II. 110. Cartwright probably had no hand in this first Admonition, if Mr. *Neal's* account of him is true; for he says, that, in 1570, "Mr. Cartwright, being now out of all employment" — being forbidden to read lectures, denied his degree of doctor in divinity, deprived of his professorship, and expelled from the university — "travelled beyond sea. While he was abroad he was chosen minister to the English merchants at Antwerp, and afterwards at Middleburgh, where he continued *two years*, with little or no profit to himself." — *Hist. Pur.*, I. 282. And from his foreign residence, Cartwright did not

of the puritans; it exposed the corruptions of the hierarchy, and the cruel proceedings of the bishops. It contained, also, a platform of a church; the manner of electing ministers; their several duties, and their equality in government; and concluded with a petition to parliament that a discipline more consonant with the Scriptures, and more in accordance with that of the reformed churches of the continent than was that of the English church, might be established by law in England. The fundamental idea of this proposed reformation was that which lies at the foundation of the Congregational system: "In matters of government and discipline, the word of God is our only warrant; but rites and ceremonies not mentioned in the Scripture are to be used or refused, as shall best appear to the edification of the church." *

Cartwright maintained essentially the same great principle — that the holy Scriptures were not only a standard of doctrine, but of discipline and government also; and that the church of Christ in all ages was to be regulated by them. While Whitgift, the archbishop's champion, maintained, "that, though the holy Scriptures were a perfect rule of faith, they were not designed as a standard of church discipline or government; but that this was changeable, and might be accommodated to the civil government we live under; that the apostoli-

apparently return until after the publication of the first Admonition. — *Neal*, I. 301.

* *Brook's Lives of Puritans*, II. 189.

cal government was adapted to the church in its infancy, and under persecution, but was to be enlarged and altered as the church grew to maturity, and had the civil magistrate on its side." *

Messrs. Wilcox and Field presented their petition to the house, or to some members of it, among whom Mr. Wilcox had friends, who were well disposed to second his laudable efforts at reformation.† For this bold step, the petitioners were arrested (July 7th, 1572) and thrown into prison, and after three months' confinement, sentenced, on the 2d of October, to one year's imprisonment in the common jail of Newgate, agreeably to the Act of Uniformity (sect. 2) against "declaring anything in derogation or depraving of the Book of Common

* *Neal*, I. 307.

† "Mr. Wilcox was intimate with the celebrated Sir Peter Wentworth, who had the highest respect and esteem for him." — *Brook*, II. 193. *Strype*, in his *Annals*, (vol. II. pt. I. ch. 20, p. 275,) says: "Two of these [new-discipline men] were taken up and imprisoned, namely, Field and Wilcox, for offering this seditious book [the Admonition] to the parliament." But in *Whitgift's Life* (I. 54) he says: "The book was called 'An Admonition to the Parliament (first and second part),' though it never was offered to them." *Whitgift*, in his *Defense*, (p. 13,) says: "They [the puritans] did not only propounde it [the Admonition] out of time [after the parliament was ended], but out of order also, that is, in the manner of a libell" — a little book. *Soames* says: "It never came before the members [of parliament] in their corporate capacity. The world knew nothing of it until the prorogation." — *Eliz. Hist.*, p. 163. This may be true, and yet the Admonition may have been presented to some member of parliament by Wilcox, to be laid before the house; and even been offered to the house, and not have been publicly known until it was published after the prorogation.

Prayer." And though the sufferers urged, that "they had not attempted to correct or change anything of themselves, but only by parliament, and with the queen's approbation, in a quiet and legal way"; and though earnest petitions were addressed to Burleigh, to Leicester, and to the council; yet these poor men were compelled to pay the full forfeit of the statute, and more too, amidst the filth and pestilential atmosphere of a London prison, among the vilest creatures of earth. They were so poor that they could neither buy food nor clothing that was suitable; while their wives and children were left beggars by the confinement of their natural guardians. And all this for presuming to exercise the right of freeborn Englishmen, to petition parliament for the reform of notorious public grievances. Such were the tender mercies of the great queen Elizabeth and her chosen instruments of hierarchal government.

But, though these petitioners were thus doomed to a loathsome prison, their petition had free course; and, in spite of all the efforts of Archbishop Parker and his coadjutors, passed through three or four editions in the course of this and the following year. So important was this matter considered by the archbishop, that, finding he could not prevent the circulation of the "Admonition," he set Dr. Whitgift to answer it.* About this time, Mr.

* *Neal*, I. 300–5; *Hopkins*, I. 415–, 441–; *Strype's Whitgift*, vol. I. p. 64; *Brook*, I. 318–. *Whitgift*, in a letter to his friend Norton, who had tried to dissuade him from answering the Admoni-

Cartwright returned to England, and was induced to enter the lists against Whitgift. He published first: "A Second Admonition, with a Humble Petition to both houses of Parliament for Relief against Subscription"; and also, "A Reply to Whitgift's Answer."

In December, 1572, Mr. Wilcox and Mr. Field wrote a confession of their faith, with a preface, "to testify their persuasion in the faith, against the uncharitable surmises of Dr. Whitgift, uttered in his answer to their Admonition, in defence both of themselves and their fautors." This was dated at Newgate, December 4th, 1572, where they had then been held prisoners for a year and four months, "which they apprehended to be contrary to law"; and by which "they and their poor wives and children were utterly impoverished, their health very much impaired by the unwholesome savor of the place, and the cold weather"; and where, they sup-

tion, on the ground that the matter would more quickly die out if let alone, says: "There is no likelihood that the matter should die, seeing the book be *once again* printed, and in every man's hand and mouth." This letter was dated "the 25th of October, 1572"; so that the "Admonition" had reached a second edition within a few months of its first publication. — *Strype's Whitgift*, I. 62. *Strype's Parker* (II. 109) says: "The Admonition had now by this time [before the close of 1572] been printed and reprinted privately no less than *four* times, (in such a vogue it was,) notwithstanding the diligence of the bishops to suppress it." *Strype* is evidently mistaken when he says, "Thomas Cartwright was the chief author." *Brook* says: "Mr. Cartwright was *not* the author, as many writers have asserted, but Mr. John Field, assisted by Mr. Thomas Wilcox." — *Lives of the Puritans*, II. 148.

posed, "they were like to suffer yet greater extremities." This document, expressing as it doubtless does the opinions and faith of multitudes of good men in the English nation, who were at that time struggling up from the rubbish of popery and tyranny, towards scriptural truth and order in the churches, deserves attention.*

In the preface, the authors say: "Because we would have bishops unlorded, according to God's word, therefore it is said, we seek the overthrow of civil magistrates; because we say, all bishops and ministers are equal, and therefore may not exercise sovereignty over one another, therefore they say, when they have brought this in among the bishops, we shall be for levelling the nobility of the land; because we find fault with the regimen of the church as drawn from the pope, therefore they say, we design the ruin of the State; because we say the ministry must not be a bare reading ministry, but that every minister must be learned, able to preach, to refute gainsayers, to comfort, to rebuke, and to do all the duties of a shepherd, a watchman, and a steward, therefore they bear the world in hand, that we condemn the reading of the holy Scriptures in churches; because we are afraid of joining with the church in all her rites and ceremonies, therefore we are branded with the odious

* *Neal* says: "I have the whole before me [in manuscript], but shall only transcribe a few passages relating to the present controversy." — Vol. I. p. 303, note. See also vol. I. p. 282.

names of Donatists, Aerians, Arians, Hickfeldians, Puritans," etc.

The confession contains the following statements, to most of which modern Congregationalists would cheerfully assent: "We hold and believe that we ought to keep inviolably that kind of government that is left us in the gospel. — That the office of a pastor is to preach the word and administer the sacraments; and therefore, that bare *readers*, or single *service-sayers*, are no more fit for pastors than women and children that can read well; yet we deny not the reading of the Scriptures in all congregations; but this is not a part of the minister's office. — We affirm that the church of God is a company, or congregation, of the faithful, called and gathered out of the world by the preaching of the gospel, united in the true faith, and resolving to form their lives, government, order, and ceremonies according to the word of God. — We hold that there ought to be joined to the pastors of the church, *elders* and *deacons*, for the bridling of vices, and providing for the poor. — That no pastor ought to usurp dominion over another; nor any church exercise lordship or rule over another. — We believe that the pastor should be chosen by the congregation; and being chosen, should be confirmed in his vocation by the elders, with public prayer and imposition of hands. — Concerning ceremonies, we hold that they ought to be few, and such as have no show of evil, but manifestly tend to decency and good order. We reject, therefore, all

popish ceremonies and apparel. — We hold that churches may differ in order and ceremonies, and yet keep the unity of the faith; and therefore we condemn not other churches that have ceremonies different from ours." *

The public enunciations of Cartwright, followed by those of Field and Wilcox, fairly opened a new era in the history of puritanism. They brought men out upon a higher plain, to more scriptural ground as to church order and government, than had been publicly taken since the exiles in Frankfort framed their "New Discipline," which claimed for particular churches, or congregations of believers, the scriptural right to choose their own ministers and deacons, and to administer their own affairs by the voice of the majority of the congregation.† There was, to be sure, as early as about 1560, an anonymous paper written, doubtless by some puritan reformer, which claimed this apostolic right for the churches; but it does not seem to have attracted much attention.‡ Now, however, these and kindred sentiments began to find free

* *Neal's Puritans*, I. 303, 304, note.

† See *ante*, pp. 385–98.

‡ See *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 17, pp. 312–18. This paper is entitled: "Notes for some reformation of the ministry and ministers in this corrupt time and state of the church of England, to be observed until better reformation may be devised and executed." It contains nine articles, the first of which reads thus: "First, that none be admitted into the ministry of the word and sacraments, but such as be able to minister the same according to God's word, and such as shall be at the same time admitted to a certain place and congregation."

utterance and hearty belief. For example: the Rev. William Charke, fellow of Peter-house, Cambridge, "a man of parts," in a *concio ad clerum*, delivered in the university pulpit, December, 1572, maintained, among other things, the following startling propositions: 1st. That "bishops, archbishops, metropolitans, patriarchs, and popes were introduced into the church by Satan. 2d. That among ministers of the church, one ought not to be superior to another."* The Rev. Edward Deering, Lady Margaret lecturer to the university of Cambridge, is charged with saying, in one of his lectures, "that of right the election of ministers to benefices or cures belongeth to the people, and of ancient writers is justified that it ought to be so."† And in a letter to Lord Burleigh, November 1st, 1573, he draws this striking contrast between the primitive bishops and those who then reigned in England: "The bishops and ministers were then one in degree; now they are divers. There were many bishops in one town; now there is but one in a whole county. No bishop's authority was more than in one city; now it is in many shires. The bishops then used no bodily punishments; now they imprison, fine, etc. Those bishops could not excommunicate or absolve, of their own authority; now they may. Then, without consent, they could make no ministers; now they do. They

* *Strype's Whitgift*, I. 88; *Parker*, II. 194; *Annals*, vol. II. pt. I. ch. 20, p. 278.

† *Strype's Parker*, II. 240.

could confirm no children in other parishes; they do now in many shires. Then they had no living of the church, but only in one congregation; now they have. Then they had no officials under them, nor commissaries, nor chancellors. Then they dealt in no civil government, by any established authority. Then they had no right in alienating any parsonage, to give in lease. Then they had the church where they served the cure, even as those whom we call now *parish priests*, although they were metropolitans or archbishops." *

A little before this time, the puritans who still remained in the church of England had put in operation private associations among themselves, with a view to personal improvement, and to supply in part the lack of discipline and religious instruction in the church. In addition to other self-imposed duties, these associationists had agreed to maintain religious exercises, at which one after another should speak on some text of Scripture or important religious topic, adapted to improve their own minds and hearts, and their parishioners' and others who should be present on the occasion. These meetings were commonly called "Exercises," or "Prophecyings"; the name being suggested by the apostle's words to the Corinthian church (1 Cor. xiv.): "Ye may all *prophesy*, one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted." These exercises soon became quite popular, attracting the

* *Strype's Annals*, vol. II. pt. I. ch. 28, pp. 411, 412; *Hopkins*, I. 517.

laity, and even the magistrates to them; and, receiving the countenance of many of the bishops, they rapidly extended into different parts of the kingdom, and "were much used now throughout most of the dioceses." *

It seems to us strange that any one who had the best interest of the English nation at heart could have objected to these exercises. But there was one English woman, of great influence, to whom they were quite distasteful, namely, Elizabeth Tudor; "seeing, probably," says her apologist, "how very apt they were to be abused. Nor did she like that the laity should neglect their secular affairs by repairing to these meetings [which were held usually on Tuesdays and Thursdays]; which she thought also might fill their heads with notions, and so occasion discussions and unquiet disputes, and it may be seditions in the State." She was offended, also, at the number of preachers who attended these meetings. She thought that three or four preachers to a county were all sufficient! and that reading of homilies to the people was enough. She, therefore, ordered the suppression of the exercises, and the reduction of the number of the clergy.†

* *Strype's Annals*, vol. II. pt. I. chaps. 10, 31, pp. 133, 325, 472–; vol. II. pt. II. ch. 25, p. 494; *Grindal*, p. 260; *Neal*, I. 390–; *Heylyn's Hist. Presb.*, pp. 245–, sect. 15.

† This final order for suppressing the prophecyings was given to Grindal some time in 1576, he being then archbishop of Canterbury. The good man had the courage to disobey the queen's orders, and to write her a plain and earnest and able protest. For

England at this time probably had a population of five million souls, dispersed over forty counties; or, including Wales, sixty-two counties; now, to give each of these counties *four* preachers, would give about one preacher to every twenty thousand souls!* The queen had her will, and even more, probably, than she willed; for soon whole counties were without a single preacher. Neal says, that in the year 1579 the populous town of Northampton had not a single preacher! and that there were in the county of Cornwall one hundred and forty clergymen, not one of whom was capable of preaching a sermon, and most of whom were pluralists or non-residents; and even that the city of London was in a lamentable case. A petition, presented to

this he lost her favor, and was suspended and sequestered; and the queen sent her commands directly "to the bishops throughout England, to suppress the exercise called prophecying." — *Strype's Grindal*, p. 28, and Appendix, No. 9, which contains Grindal's noble letter to the queen, dated December 20th, 1576, and App. No. 10, which contains the queen's letter to the bishops of England, ordering the suppression of prophecying. But two years previous, as early as March 25th, 1574, Parker, by command of the queen, forbade these meetings in the diocese of Norwich. The reason assigned was, that many of the ministers took occasion in these meetings "to vent controversies concerning matters of church discipline, and to call in question the establishment of this church by episcopacy." — *Strype's Parker*, II. 358–62. The bishop of Norwich, Parkhurst, submitted to this order very reluctantly, protesting that there had been irregularities only "once or twice by busy speakers against conformity in religion. But that they had been silenced until they should subscribe the articles," etc. — *Annals*, vol. II. pt. I. ch. 31, p. 477.

* *McCulloch's Brit. Empire*, vol. I. pt. I. sect. 1, partic. p. 399.

the parliament of 1579–80, says that at least one half the churches of the city were unfurnished with preaching ministers; and scarcely one in ten, even of those which had ministers, had men who conscientiously served their parishioners.* In the supplication of the people of Cornwall, they say: "We are above the number of fourscore and ten thousand souls, which for the want of the word of God are in extreme misery and ready to perish; and this, neither for want of maintenance nor place; for, besides the appropriations in our shire, we allow yearly about nine thousand two hundred pounds, and have about one hundred and sixty churches, the greatest part of which are supplied by men who are guilty of the grossest sins; some fornicators, some adulterers, some felons, bearing the marks in their hands for the said offence, some drunkards, gamesters on the Sabbath-day," etc. †

The description of a contemporary writer of this period of the ministry of the church of England, though incidentally introduced, is confirmatory of the preceding statements. The author of the "Brief Discourse," (probably William Whittingham,) published in England in 1575, says: "It is high time to look unto this [the correct translation of the Bible], considering that in most parts of this realm preachers ye have none, nor any that can or will preach (very few excepted) saving certain wanderers, amongst whom (and specially in some

* *Hist. Pur.*, I. 868. † *Neal*, I. 869.

shires) are such ruffianly rake-hells, and common cozeners permitted and suffered, by whose preachings the word of truth is become odious in the eyes of the people. Seeing then, I say, that in most places the ministry doth stand and consist of old popish priests, tolerated readers, and many new-made ministers, whose readings are such that the people cannot be edified, especially when one is tolerated to serve two or three churches, and turning their backs to the people, I leave to the consideration of such (who have to deal in this matter) what great and intolerable mischances may come more and more (by suffering such corrupt Bibles in churches and elsewhere) to the poor simple flock of Christ." *

Another measure, devised by the puritans "after some debate," to secure a degree of discipline in the church, and to promote the cause of religion generally, was to organize presbyteries. The first association of this kind in England was formed at Wandsworth, a small village of Surrey, about five miles from London, on the river Wandle, near its entrance into the Thames. This occurred probably early in the summer of 1572. Fifteen or sixteen clergymen, with "a number of very considerable laymen," united in this measure. And on the 20th of November, eleven elders were chosen. Though the bishops were almost immediately informed of this movement, and the ecclesiastical commission-

* *Brief Discourse*, p. cxciii.

ers at once adopted measures to discover these bold innovators, the secret was so well kept that none of the members could be detected; nor could the formation of similar associations in neighboring counties be prevented.*

During the years 1571–72, not less than one hundred clergymen, suspected of puritan tendencies, were deprived of their benefices and ecclesiastical preferments; and "great numbers of both sexes all over the realm, who were suspected of religion not agreeable to the State, were committed to close prison." †

* *Neal*, I. 318; *Hist. Surrey*, vol. III. p. 342; *Fuller's Ch. Hist.*, vol. II. bk. IX. sect. 8, p. 505.

Neal calls this "the first Presbyterian church in England"; and *Collier* (VI. 520) says the puritans now "set up altar against altar, and declare for a separate communion." But it is doubtful whether this was in its design anything more than a modification of the Northampton associational scheme. Compare *Strype's Parker*, II. 282–85; *Collier*, VI. 519–30; *Neal*, I. 330; *Hopkins*, II. 265, 438, and notes. *Fuller* gives the names of sixteen clergymen who were concerned in the formation of this presbytery, and divides them into "two sorts of ministers": Field, Wilcox, Standen, Jackson, Bonham, Seintlac, Crane, and Edmonds, he says, were "principally against ministers' attire and the common prayer book"; while Charke, Travers, Barber, Gardner, Cheston, Crooke, Egerton, "endeavored the modelling of a new discipline; and it was not long before, both streams uniting together, non-conformity began to bear a large and great channel in the city of London." — *Ut sup.* But if Field and Wilcox were original members of this presbytery, it must have been organized previously to July 7th, 1572; for on that day they were both committed to prison, where they were kept until the close of 1573, if not longer. See *ante*, p. 481; *Brook's Pur.*, I. 322; *Soames' Eliz. Hist.*, 186.

† *Strype's Annals*, vol. II. pt. I. chaps. 7 and 20, pp. 106, 276, 277; *Neal*, I. 299; *Hopkins*, I. 457.

A new issue of the Admonition to the parliament, in 1573, and Cartwright's reply to Whitgift's Answer, and the murder of one of the queen's officers, by a crazy man, reputed to be a puritan, awakened anew the anger of the queen, and she issued a proclamation in June against the Admonition and the Reply, and ordered all who had them in possession to bring them in, under pain of imprisonment.* The archbishop was greatly exercised by the state of things, and particularly that not one of the condemned books had been brought to the bishop of London, though there were, doubtless, some thousands of them dispersed in the city and other parts of his diocese. Parker, however, found some relief in the sessions of the commissioners, in the star chamber. Coming home from one of these meetings, where sundry puritans had been under examination, we are told that the archbishop seconded what he had done at the star chamber, by a letter to the lord treasurer. "They had been there," he said, "pretty brisk upon these men, but fearing they should cool again, as they had done formerly, he excited him and all the rest, in his said letter, to proceed against them." †

To help her archbishop in his merciless persecution of the puritans, the queen issued a proclama-

* If the reader would understand the views of the persecuting party in Church and State of this Hacket affair, he should read Dr. Cosin's *Conspiracie for Pretended Reformation*. It is bound up with *Paule's Life of Whitgift*.

† *Strype's Parker*, II. 255–58; *Neal*, I. 309, 318.

tion on the 20th of October, 1573, commanding all archbishops and bishops, all justices of assizes, and all others having authority, to put in execution the Act for the Uniformity of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, with all diligence and severity; and requiring the immediate arrest and imprisonment of all offenders, and the punishment, "with more care and diligence than heretofore hath been done," of all who should neglect to come to the common prayer, and to receive the sacraments of the church according to the order in the book allowed. And further, commanding that if any persons should, either in private houses or public places, make assemblies, and therein use other rites of common prayer and administration of the sacraments than is prescribed in the said book, or should maintain in their houses any persons notoriously charged with any attempts to alter the said orders, by books or preaching, they should see such persons punished with all severity.* This proclamation was followed, on the 7th of November, by a sharp letter from the council, by the queen's command, addressed to the bishops, in which they were told, that "it was mostly their fault that such diversities, contentions, and unseemly disputations had arisen; that they and their officers had heretofore performed their visitations and held their courts more — and more the pity — to

* *Cardwell's Documentary Annals*, vol. i. No. LXXIX. p. 388, Oxford, 1844; *Strype's Parker*, ii. 320.

get money, or for some other sinister purposes, than to keep their churches in uniform and godly order." *

This, certainly, might be called being "pretty brisk" with the bishops and commissioners, but all this even did not satisfy the imperious queen; so on the 28th of November the ecclesiastical commissioners were called into the star chamber to receive the final instructions and the strict injunctions of her majesty, before setting out on their several circuits. They were then told by the lord treasurer, in the queen's name, that "a number of vicars and curates, preachers and readers, young in years, but over-young in brains, have made sundry alterations, according to their own imaginations and conceits, in the common services of the church. They have also diffused erroneous opinions, such as make men think the prescribed orders and rites of the church burdenous to conscience. This is a matter pernicious to the state of government, a danger which her majesty, by the charge committed to her by Almighty God, is bound to stay by speedy good means. These corrupt opinions tend to the violation of laws without offence to conscience. Hence come violent and audacious attempts, of which her majesty is daily hearing. And as you are now to repair to your several counties, she reiterates her earnest intent to reform these disorders and corruptions, which are brought about

* *Cardwell*, vol. i. No. lxxx. p. 387; *Strype's Parker*, ii. 345.

both by malpractice and by unsound doctrine. She cannot be quiet in her conscience without earnestly prosecuting the reformation hereof; nor can she think any of her subjects, especially her ecclesiastical officers, worthy to live under her protection, or anywise to enjoy her favor, who shall directly or indirectly maintain any person to alter, by example or doctrine, the established orders of the church." *

Stimulated by these pungent instructions from the queen, the ecclesiastical commissioners went forth, fired with new zeal and girded with new strength, to their hateful work of persecution. Strict and harsh as had been their previous inquisitions and judgments, new and more cruel measures were now devised, to entangle, convict, and punish all nonconformists, lay as well as clerical. New forms of subscription were drawn up, and new modes of objuration invented and practised by them; and all puritans who could be reached by these inquisitors, however blameless and exemplary their lives and character, were immediately subjected to arrest, to exorbitant costs and heavy fines, or to imprisonment in the common jails, where they were often suffered to languish for months without even a trial. By these means many honest, conscientious men were impoverished, and broken in health, and actually killed, even when nothing could be proved against them but

* *Strype's Parker*, II. 350.

their unwillingness to submit to illegal tests and oaths.*

Thus, says Strype, "the prosecution of the puritans went now vigorously forward, more than ever it had done, the queen being resolved to suppress them. About this time, in the beginning of the year, divers of the most eminent men among them were taken up and brought before the council, and before the ecclesiastical commission. And particularly about Cartwright's book, several were examined, namely, Dering, Wiborn, Johnson, Brown, Field, Wilcox, Sparrow, and King." The last four were sent to prison, and the others were suspended and silenced. This inquisition was not on account of anything which they were accused of having done amiss, but to ascertain their secret opinions on sundry points; as, Whether it was lawful to condemn what was established by public authority, until supplication had been made to said authority under the person's own name? — Whether the book of service be good and godly, every title grounded on the holy Scriptures? — Whether the book of articles established by parliament be agreeable to God's word or not? — Whether we must of necessity follow the primitive church in such things as be used or established or not? — Whether all ministers in the church of God should be of equal authority? †

* *Neal's Puritans*, I. 320–30.

† *Strype's Parker*, II. 238–41; *Collier*, VI. 523.

Many suffered at this time, of whom there is now no particular record on earth; as is evident from what Mr. Wilcox writes to "Good Father Gilby," December 21, 1573: "Mr. Fulwer, our dear friend and brother in the Lord, with *divers others*, are prisoners in the same Compter, and for the same cause that our brother Edmunds is. Our brother Johnson, minister of the church without Temple Bar, and others with him, are laid in the Gatehouse, at Westminster. Our brother Wight, and others with him, are committed to Newgate." And in a letter dated six weeks after the above, Mr. Wilcox tells father Gilby that "the commissioners go forward in their haughty proceedings. Three of them that they have imprisoned are dead already. What shall become of the rest, God knoweth. We here persuade ourselves of nothing but great extremity." * Brook, in his Lives of the Puritans, has preserved a record of many of the sufferers of this year, and alludes generally to many others of whom no particulars remain.† The case of Robert Johnson, of King's College, Cambridge, and domestic chaplain in Lord Keeper Bacon's family, was one of peculiar hardship. For some slight deviations from order, he was imprisoned in the Gatehouse, in December, 1573, where he sickened, and notwithstanding the efforts of the council even, was suffered by Parker and Sandys to die in prison. Several others, cast into prison

* *Brook*, II. 192. † *Ib.*, I. 85.

at the same time, also perished. And no wonder, if Johnson's description of the prisons was true: "Filthy jails, more unwholesome than dunghills, and more stinking than pigsties." *

Mr. Bonham, Mr. Standen, and Mr. Fenn were committed to prison this same year; and though two of them sickened in prison, it required a second and peremptory order to the archbishop from the lords of the council, in the queen's name, even to get them a hearing before their judges.† Such was clerical mercy towards nonconformists. About the same time, five clergymen of the diocese of Peterborough were suspended, and then deprived of their livings, for the same offence. Four of these men had been licensed by the university as learned and religious divines. Many ministers in the diocese of Norwich were prosecuted in the ecclesiastical courts; and many nonconformists in the university of Cambridge suffered severely. Even laymen were committed to prison for this same crime of nonconformity; spies being stationed in the parish churches to detect those who absented themselves.‡

A striking illustration of the tyranny of these times is furnished by Strype, in his account of the treatment experienced by certain religiously dis-

* *Brook* (I. 176–88, III. 503–6) gives a full and interesting account of Robert Johnson, with a specimen of his examination before the ecclesiastical governors, his letters to his persecutors, etc.

† *Brook*, I. 174–76.

‡ *Ib.*, I. 86, 145; *Neal*, I. 327.

posed conformists in Balsham, Cambridgeshire, and Strethall, Essex, in 1574. It seems that some of the inhabitants of these parishes had contracted the habit of meeting together on holy-days, after dinner or supper, for religious conference and worship, and to read the Scriptures and confirm each other in Christian faith, and for the reformation of vice in themselves and their families. The ecclesiastical commissioners hearing of these "unlawful assemblies," immediately sent for the ministers of these parishes, and ordered them to suppress forthwith these dangerous meetings, and it was done; though the parties complained of declared: "We do not favor or maintain any of the opinions of the anabaptists, puritans, papists, or libertines, but would be glad to learn our duty towards God, our prince, and magistrates, towards our neighbors and our families, in such sort as becomes good and faithful and obedient subjects"; and though they thus plead, in excuse for their religious meetings: "The occasion of our assemblies on the holy-days after supper was this: for that heretofore we have at divers times spent and consumed our holy-days vainly, in drinking at the alehouse, and playing at cards, tables, dice, and other vain pastimes, for the which we have been often blamed of our parson, we thought it better to bestow the time in sober and godly reading the Scriptures, only for the purpose aforesaid and no other." *

* *Strype's Parker*, II. 381–85; *Neal's Hist. Pur.*, I. 388.

Notwithstanding the harmless and Christian character of these poor men and their meetings, Mr. Strype tells us: "Yet such were the times now, that even these commendable courses were strictly and jealously looked into by special order from the archbishop." Or, in other words, the rulers of the church of England thought it a less evil for men to spend their time on holy-days in drinking and gaming, than in "unauthorized" meetings for reading the Scriptures, prayer, and conference!

In May, 1575, that arch-persecutor, Matthew Parker, archbishop of Canterbury, was called to his final account, having pursued the puritans with relentless rigor to the very close of his threescore and twelve years. He was a man of moderate abilities, a narrow mind, and a hard, unsympathizing nature, and possessed an unusual amount of dogged perseverance, mixed largely with petulant impatience when crossed in his persecuting plans, or not duly supported.

Edmund Grindal, archbishop of York, was elected to the vacant throne of Canterbury, on the queen's nomination, and entered on the duties, responsibilities, and trials of the office, February 15th, 1575-76. But not proving a sufficiently pliable instrument in the hands of the arbitrary queen — being in fact too conscientious and good a man to occupy the metropolitan's seat in times like those in which he lived — he was soon laid aside, and ultimately gave place to John Whitgift, a worthy successor of Matthew Parker.

The work of persecution for conscience' sake was carried on with unremitting activity during the years 1576–80. Many faithful ministers were shut up in prison; others were silenced or suspended for the most trivial deviations from canonical conformity, such as not using the surplice when officiating, neglecting to make the sign of the cross in baptism, not using the ring in the marriage-service, or omitting some part of the common prayer in public worship. For these and such like offences, numbers of learned and pious men were indicted at the assizes, and subjected to cruel and humiliating punishments.*

Among the sufferers of this period were the Rev. John Nash, who was imprisoned in the Marshalsea, William Drewet, who was sent to Newgate, and Rev. Mr. Harvey, a learned and zealous minister of Norwich, who was suspended. This good man, in a letter to his bishop, on his suspension, uttered some plain, bold truths. He told his lordship, among other things: "We find in the Scriptures of truth, that when Christ ruled and reigned in his church, his officers were bishops or pastors, and elders and deacons. But when the pope set aside this government, he appointed new governors in the church, as cardinals, archbishops, lordships, deans, chancellors, commissioners, and many others. The government of the church is much the same as it was under popery. The pope's officers,

* *Neal*, I. 373; *Brook's Puritans*, I. 37–43, 278, 449; III. 507.

you know, still bear rule; and therefore the reins of government are not in the hands of Christ, but in the hands of antichrist. Moreover, as Jesus Christ is the only lawgiver in his church, and he alone has power and authority to appoint its officers, if any king or prince in the world appoint other officers in the church than Christ hath already allowed and appointed, we will lay down our necks upon the block rather than consent to them." *

Nine ministers of Norwich or its immediate vicinity were suspended about this time, besides numbers in other parts of the kingdom.

These violent proceedings called forth remonstrances from gentlemen of influence in different quarters. One from Suffolk, addressed to the lords of the council, holds the following language: "The painful pastors and ministers of the word — by what justice we know not — are now of late brought to the bar at every assize, marshalled with the worst malefactors, indicted, arraigned, and condemned for matters, as we presume, of very slender moment: some for singing the hymn *Nunc Dimittis* in the morning; some for turning the question in baptism from the infants to the godfathers, which is only *you* for *thou;* some for leaving out the cross in baptism; some for leaving out the ring in marriage; whereunto neither the law nor the law-makers, in our judgment, had ever any regard." †

* *Brook*, I. 192.

† *Parte of a Register*, p. 128, in *Brook*, I. 43.

But the queen and many of her bishops and counsellors thought otherwise. They insisted on tithing the mint, and the cummin, and the anise; they demanded an exact and punctilious regard to every external rite, ceremony, and usage of the law-established church; while the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith, they recklessly disregarded.

A striking illustration of the sensitive bigotry of the queen is furnished by her treatment of the parliament of 1579–80. Early in the session, the commons passed a vote to this effect: "That as many of their members as conveniently could, should, on the Sunday fortnight, assemble and meet together in the Temple church, there to have preaching, and to join together in prayer, with humiliation and fasting, for the assistance of God's Spirit in all their consultations during the parliament; and for the preservation of the queen's majesty and her realms." No sooner, however, was this modest and pious resolution known to her majesty, than she took the alarm, and scenting danger, if not treason, in the measure, ordered her vice-chamberlain, Sir Christopher Hatton, to inform the commons that "she did much admire at so great a rashness in that house as to put in execution such an innovation, without her privity and pleasure first made known unto them." Sir Christopher then moved the house "to make humble submission to her majesty, acknowledging said offence and contempt, craving the remission of the

same, with a full purpose to forbear the committing of the like hereafter." This was done, and so the matter ended.*

But this movement of the commons furnished a pretence for the queen to exact additional parliamentary protection for her royal prerogative, in the form of a new statute, entitled: "An Act to retain the Queen's Majesty's Subjects in their due Obedience." The fifth section of this act provides "that every person above the age of sixteen years, which shall not repair to some church, chapel, or usual place of common prayer, shall forfeit to the queen's majesty for every month after the end of this session of parliament, which he or she shall so forbear, *twenty pounds* of lawful English money; and that, over and besides the said forfeitures, every person so forbearing by the space of twelve months, as aforesaid, shall, for his or her obstinacy, be bound with two sufficient sureties, in the sum of *two hundred pounds* at least, to good behavior; and so to continue bound until such time as the persons so bound do conform themselves and come to the church." Another section provides that "if any person shall devise, write, print, or set forth, any book, rhyme, ballad, letter, or writing, containing any false, seditious, and slanderous matter, to the defamation of the queen, or to the stirring or moving of any rebellion, or shall cause any such book, rhyme, writing, etc., to be

* *Heylyn's Hist. Preb.*, p. 249; *Neal*, i. 871.

written, printed, or published, then every such offence shall be adjudged *felony*." *

The imperious queen went even beyond what has now been recorded, in humbling this very parliament. The commons being pressed with petitions for the removal of unfaithful, unworthy, and dissolute ministers — men that were gamesters on the Sabbath day, drunkards, fornicators, adulterers, felons, bearing the marks of their crimes in their hands — and the appointment of faithful men, who would preach the word of God; and being forbidden by her majesty to take any action themselves, ventured to raise a committee to confer with the bishops touching some reformation of the church, and to move her highness in it. Some of the bishops feeling the necessity of reformation in the particulars complained of, joined the commons in a petition to her majesty. She received the petition, and directed Sandys, the archbishop of York — Grindal, of Canterbury, being then "under a cloud" — to call to him three or four bishops to consult about the matter. They agreed on certain reformations, which they "thought good, and could gladly yield" to, and made their report to the queen. She took the report and retained it; and when pressed for an answer, replied that she "was sufficient of herself to deal with the clergy in matters ecclesiastical, and that the parliament-house should not meddle therein, neither could her majesty yield

* *Statutes*, 28 Eliz. ch. 1, sect. 5, and ch. 2, sect. 1.

unto the alteration of any ecclesiastical law."* Thus ended the last attempt of the commons to secure some relief for the suffering puritans.

These accumulating acts of ecclesiastical tyranny were more than enough to satisfy some of the puritans that nothing remained for them but abject submission to the queen's authority in matters ecclesiastical, or open separation from the church of England. Multitudes chose the latter alternative, resolving to worship God agreeably to the dictates of their consciences, enlightened by God's word, and dare the wrath of their despotic and irreligious queen. And to the history of these brave Christians we now especially turn; for among them will be found the men who reasserted the principles of Congregationalism, and finally succeeded, at the cost of great suffering, and even of their very lives, in firmly establishing in England this scriptural and apostolic system of church order and government.

* *Neal*, I. 86; *Hopkins*, II. 171–80; Sandys' letter to William Chatterton, in *Peck's Desiderata Curiosa*, vol. I. bk. III. No. 29, Lond. 1779, quarto.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A, TO PAGE 205.

OPINIONS OF THE FATHERS OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

PEIRCE, in his *Vindication of the Dissenters*, says: — "All our divines, who truly hated popery, labored earnestly, in the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, that the reformation begun in King Edward's time might now be carried on much further. But the queen was of another mind, and she managed all things as she pleased. But it will give less offence if I use here churchmen's words, rather than my own. Mr. George Cranmer, in his letter to Mr. Hooker, says: 'It may be remembered that at first the greatest part of the learned of the land were either eagerly affected, or favorably inclined that way [of the nonconformists]. The books then written for the most part savored of the disciplinary style; it sounded everywhere in pulpits, and in common phrase of men's speech. The contrary part began to fear they had taken a wrong course.'

"Bishop Burnet likewise tells us: 'It appears by the letters of the bishops to Bullinger, that they preserved the ancient habits rather in compliance with the queen's inclinations than out of any liking they had to them. Jewel, in a letter bearing date the 8th of February, 1566, wishes that the vestments, together with all the other remnants of popery, might be thrown out of their churches, and out of the minds of the people; and laments the queen's fixedness to them, so that she would suffer no change to be made. And in January of the same year, Sandys writes to the same purpose: Disputes are now on foot concerning the popish vestments, whether they

should be used or not; but God will put an end to these things. Horn, bishop of Winchester, went even further; for in a letter dated 16th of July, 1565, he writes of the act concerning the habits with great regret, and he seems to stand in doubt whether he should conform to it or not. And in many letters writ on that subject, it is asserted that both Cranmer and Ridley intended to procure an act for abolishing the habits; and that they only defended their lawfulness, but not their fitness; and therefore they blamed private persons that refused to obey the laws. Grindal, in a letter dated the 27th of August, 1566, writes that all the bishops who had been beyond sea, had, at their return, dealt with the queen to let the matter of habits fall; but she was so prepossessed, that, though they had all endeavored to divert her from prosecuting the matter, she continued still inflexible. This had made them submit to the laws, and to wait for a fit opportunity to reverse them. Cox, bishop of Ely, in one of his letters, laments the aversion they found in the Parliament to all the propositions that were made for the reformation of abuses.' . . . And when some matters enjoined by the Common Prayer Book were charged upon the bishops by Bullinger, and some other learned foreigners of the Reformation, they [the bishops] replied in their letters, 'that none of them were of the parliament house at the passing of the book, and that they had therefore no voice in making of the law. But that after it was passed, they, being chosen to be bishops, must either content themselves to take their places, or else leave them to Papists and Lutherans; but in the mean space, they promised not to urge their brethren in these things; and when opportunity served, to seek reformation of them.'" — *Vindication*, pp. 43-45. London, 1717.

Though these sentiments were uttered in 1566-67, a period somewhat later than that now under consideration, they were the sentiments of men who breathed much of the spirit of Cranmer and Ridley and Hooper and Latimer, and of the pious young King Edward himself.

There is, indeed, abundant evidence in the writings of the eminent Reformers of Edward's time, that the very "fathers of

the church of England" were by no means satisfied with the Reformation as it was left by Edward, and submitted for the time to many things which they did not approve, hoping to be able to purge out abuses at a future day, which, alas, they never did. *Hooker's Ecclesiatical Polity*, Appendix No. 2, to book v. vol. II. p. 60, New York ed. 1851, or vol. I. pp. cxxv.–cxxxiii. Hanbury's ed. London, 1833. See *Jewel's Works*, Parker Soc. ed. vol. IV. p. 1267.

Jewel's words, addressed to Bullinger, Feb. 8th, 1566, and referred to above, were as follows: — "Atque utinam, omnia etiam tenuissima vestigia papatus et e templis, et multo maxime ex animis omnium, auferri possent! Sed regina ferre mutationem in religione hoc tempore nullam potest."

In Strype's account of the synod of 1562, under the head of "Rites and Ceremonies debated in the Synod," the reader will find, that not only Sandys went for a reformation in respect to the vestments, but also in respect to private baptism, and crossing the infant in the forehead, and for a general revision of ecclesiastical orders and rules, for the good government of the church. And from the same account, it will be seen that a large number of deans, archdeacons, and clergy were equally anxious for further reformation in the church; and that the Reformers missed their motion by just *one* vote, in an assembly of one hundred and seventeen. — *Strype's Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 29, pp. 499–507.

Grindal, in his letter to Bullinger, August 27th, 1566, referred to by Burnet above, says: "We who are now bishops, on our first return, and before we entered on our ministry, contended long and earnestly for the removal of those things that have occasioned the present dispute; but, as we were unable to prevail, either with the queen or the parliament, we judged it best, after a consultation on the subject, not to desert our churches for the sake of a few ceremonies, and those not unlawful in themselves, especially since the pure doctrine remained in all its integrity and freedom," etc. — *Zurich Letters*, 1st series, No. 78.

Strype says: "And as for other ceremonies used in the Romish church, these our divines could have been contented at this

juncture [1559] to have been without, observing what jealousies were taken at them; and that there might not be the least compliance with the popish devotions." And in another place he says: "And the first bishops that were made, and who were but newly returned out of their exiles, as Cox, Grindal, Horn, Sandys, Jewel, Parkhurst, Bentham, upon their first returns, before they entered upon their ministry, labored all they could against receiving into the church the papistical habits; and that all the ceremonies should be clean laid aside. But they could not obtain it from the queen and the parliament. And the habits were enacted. Then they consulted what to do, being in some doubt whether to enter into their functions. But they concluded, unanimously, not to desert their ministry, for some rites, that, as they considered, were but a few, and not evil in themselves, especially since the doctrine of the gospel remained pure and entire." — *Annals*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 13, pp. 262–64.

The depth and extent of the opposition to popish rights and ceremonies, and the earnest desire of the best men in the English church for further reformation, is forcibly expressed by Grindal in one of his letters to Bullinger, in which he says: "It is scarcely credible how much this controversy about things of no importance has disturbed our churches, and still in a great measure continues to do. Many of the most learned clergy seemed on the point of forsaking their ministry. Many of the people also had it in contemplation to withdraw from us, and set up private meetings; but, however, most of them, through the mercy of the Lord, have now returned to a better mind." — *Zurich Letters*, 1st series, No. 73.

This letter was written August 27th, 1566. It is a question which deserves an answer, how so many of the more learned and confessedly devoted clergy, and so many of the people, too, could have been so strenuous about "things of no importance." They were of importance — of great importance — as the whole subsequent history of the church shows; and the returning of so many of the exiles and other good men into the church of England, with all her imposed rites and ceremonies and orders

and constitutions derived from popery, did not settle the controversy — did not quiet the convictions of good men, and did not prove that it was not wrong to symbolize with popery.

Of all Elizabeth's first bishops, Archbishop Parker, probably, was most inclined to favor the observance of an imposing external ritual. He, alone, of all the first bench, had not been abroad and seen the simple forms of the reformed churches on the continent. "Having indeed concealed himself at home during the Marian persecution, he had never seen protestantism under any other form than that which it wore during Edward's reign. He had, accordingly, no thought of reconstructing a church upon some alleged reference to Scripture merely, and had no further wish than to free the religious system, immemorially established, from blemishes detected by recent inquirers of undeniable competence. He even doubted the expediency of removing crosses from the churches, and argued in favor of them before a parliamentary committee, assisted by Dr. Cox." — *Soames' Elizab. Relig. Hist.*, p. 15; Jewel to Peter Martyr, *Zurich Letters*, February 4th, 1560. "But Grindal, bishop of London, though satisfied with his country's liturgy, was not equally so with her ecclesiastical attire. James Pilkington, bishop of Durham, came home (from Switzerland) under apprehensions of 'unprofitable ceremonies.' Robert Horn, bishop of Winchester, landed in his native country, with such prejudices against the habits, as had usually flowed from a residence in Switzerland. The celebrated Bishop Jewel did not return from his exile at Frankfort and Zurich without sharing in the sentiments ordinarily brought home. Edwin Sandys, who filled successively the sees of Worcester, London, and York, was another brief objector to the habits. The same opinions were entertained by other prelates, but further particulars are needless. All the bench, however, that returned from exile, had contended long and earnestly, before preferment was accepted, for a complete revolution in ecclesiastical attire." — *Soames, ut sup.*, pp. 21–26.

Thomas Sampson, writing to Peter Martyr, from Strasburg, Dec. 17th, 1558, says, among other things: "Such is the degener-

acy from the primitive institution, as regards their [the bishops'] election, (for there is required neither the consent of the clergy nor of the people,) such, too, is the variety, not to say unseemliness of their superstitious dresses, that I think it hardly endurable, even if we are to act in all things according to the law of expediency." — *Zurich Letters*, 1st series, No. 1.

Jewel, in a letter to Peter Martyr, probably written in May, 1559, says: "The scenic apparatus of divine worship is now under agitation; and those very things which you and I have so often laughed at are now seriously and solemnly entertained by certain persons, (for *we* are not consulted,) as if the Christian religion could not exist without something tawdry. Our minds, indeed, are not sufficiently disengaged to make these fooleries of much importance." — *Zurich Letters*, 1st series, No. 9.

I must not, however, weary the reader with any further proof of this important truth — that the very fathers of the Reformed church of England, up to the time of which we are now writing (1553) — yea, and beyond this time even ten or fifteen years — did not regard the work of reformation in the church of England as by any means complete. They believed that not merely the popish vestments, but also sundry rites, ceremonies, and practices, authorized, instituted, and required by the governing powers in Church and State, needed reformation.

NOTE B, TO PAGE 420.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER OF EDWARD VI.

In Edward's litany there was this significant petition: — "From all sedition and privy conspiracy, from *the tyrranny of the bishop of Rome*, and all his detestable enormities," etc., "good Lord, deliver us." This was struck out of Elizabeth's prayer book. — *Edward's Lit.*, p. 233, compared with *Elizabeth's*, p. 283, Parker's Society's editions; *Strype*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 4, p. 123.

In Edward's second book is the following explanatory passage: —" Whereas it is ordained in the Book of Common Prayer, in the administration of the Lord's supper, that the communicants kneeling should receive the holy communion; which thing being well meant, for a signification of the humble and grateful acknowledging of the benefits of Christ given unto the worthy receiver, and to avoid the profanation and disorder which about the holy communion might else ensue; lest yet the same kneeling might be thought or taken otherwise, we do declare, that it is not meant thereby that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or to any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For, as concerning the sacramental bread and wine, they remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians. And as concerning the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ, they are in heaven, and not here. For it is against the truth of Christ's true natural body, to be in more places than in one at one time." — *Liturgies of Edward VI.*, p. 283. This passage is erased entirely from Elizabeth's prayer book.

It was proposed by those who revised Edward's book for Elizabeth's use, to leave it optional with the communicants to receive the sacrament standing or kneeling, as each preferred. — *Strype, ut sup.*, p. 122. But the queen made kneeling necessary: " all kneeling humbly upon their knees." — *Book of Common Prayer*, 1559, Order of the Communion; *Neal*, I. 177.

By Edward's second prayer book (1552) all the popish garments were laid aside except the surplice and rochet. The rubric reads thus: " And here it is to be noted, that the minister at the time of communion, and at all other times in his ministrations, shall use neither *alb, vestment*, nor *cope*; but being archbishop or bishop, he shall have and wear a *rochet*, and being a priest or deacon, he shall have and wear a *surplice* only." — Order for Morning and Evening Prayer, p. 217, in *Liturgies*, compared with p. 157, *ib.*

The chief difference between a *rochet* and an *alb* was, that

the former was more like a surplice, worn under the silk robes; while the *alb* was a long, close-fitting garment, reaching to the ankles and girded at the waist. Both were of linen. A *cope* was a long cloak, with a hood. It might be of any color — red, white, crimson, purple, black, etc. It was often of velvet or satin, richly embroidered, and ornamented with gold and precious stones. A *vestment* (or chasuble) was the upper or last vestment put on before celebrating mass. It was a sort of cape, or shawl, or mantle; originally perfectly round, and gathered up over the arms in front. — *Pugin's Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament and Costume.* Lond, 1846, quarto.

But Elizabeth restored these popish garments. Her service book reads: "And here is to be noted, that the minister at the time of the communion, and at all other times in his ministrations, shall use such ornaments in the church as were in use by authority of parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the VI., according to the act of parliament set in the beginning of this book." — The Order of Morning and Evening Prayer, in *Elizabeth's Liturgy*, p. 53; *Strype*, vol. I. pt. I. ch. 4, p. 123.

In the delivery of the sacramental elements there is a deviation in Elizabeth's book from Edward's, evidently designed to blind the papists. Edward's second book reads thus: "Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee; and feed on him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving." And when the cup is delivered: "Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful."

Elizabeth's book requires the minister to say in delivering the bread: "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take and eat this," etc. And at the delivering of the cup: "The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Drink this," etc. *Strype, ut sup.*, p. 124; *Edward's Liturgies*, p. 279.

Another particular in which Elizabeth reformed the church backward, was in respect to the kind of bread which was used on sacramental occasions. In the first ages of the church the

bread used for sacramental purposes was taken from common loaves. After a while, small, round rolls, called *oflets*, each containing a handful, and stamped with a cross, and the name of our Lord, were made on purpose. These continued to be used until after the middle of the eleventh century, when the *wafer*, the modern Romish *host*, came into use. These were not much larger than an American dime. Edward's first service book prescribed substantially the same kind of bread for sacramental use, except that it was to be somewhat larger and without any print upon it. "For avoiding of all matters and occasion of dissension, it is meet that the bread prepared for the communion be made, through all this realm, after one sort and fashion; that is to say, unleavened, and round, as it was afore, but without all manner of print, and something more larger and thicker than it was, so that it may be aptly divided in divers pieces; and every one shall be divided in two pieces, at the least, or more, at the discretion of the minister, and so distributed."— *Edward's Liturgies*, p. 97. In his second book, however, "to take away the superstition which any person hath or might have in the bread and wine," it is provided and directed, that "it shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten at the table with other meats, but the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten." — *Liturgies*, p. 282. Elizabeth, however, by her "Injunctions," which had the force of law, if not by her prayer book, provided for the use of the wafer cakes, prescribed in Edward's first book, which were essentially popish in their character. — *Sparrow's Collection.*

Edward's first book, in one of the communion prayers, has the following: "We commend unto thy mercy (O Lord) all other thy servants, which are departed hence from us, with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace: Grant unto them, we beseech thee, thy mercy, and everlasting peace, and that at the day of the general resurrection, we and all they which be of the mystical body of thy Son, may all together be set on his right hand, and hear that, his most joyful voice: Come unto me, O ye that be blessed of my Father, and possess the kingdom which is prepared for you from the beginning

of the world: Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Mediator and Advocate." — *Liturgies*, p. 88. Omitted in the second book, p. 271.

In the burial service the same general sentiment is repeated. "We commend into thy hands of mercy, most merciful Father, the soul of this our brother departed," etc. p. 145. "Grant, we beseech thee, that at the day of judgment his soul and all the souls of thy elect departed out of this life, may with us, and we with them, fully receive thy promises," etc., p. 146. And again, "Grant unto this thy servant, that the sins which he committed in this world be not imputed unto him," etc., p. 147. All left out of the second book.

In Edward's Injunctions, (1547,) in "the Form of Bidding the Common Prayers," we read: "Thirdly, ye shall pray for all them that be departed out of this world in the faith of Christ, that they with us, and we with them, at the day of judgment, may rest both body and soul, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven." — *Sparrow's Collection.*

Elizabeth, in her Injunctions, (1559,) varied from this direction thus: "Finally, let us praise God for all those that are departed out of this life in the faith of Christ, and pray unto God that we may have grace for to direct our lives after their good example, that, after this life, we with them may be made partakers of the glorious resurrection in the life everlasting." — *Sparrow.*

Whether or not this injunction is so worded as to give the impression that prayers for the dead were still to be continued, I leave for the reader to judge. To me, it seems very like it; especially when taken in connection with the knowledge of her general policy; and thus it seems to have been understood; for praying for the dead, though not distinctly recognized in Elizabeth's book, yet was allowed and practised in her majesty's churches for many years. Mr. Soames, in his Elizabethan History, alluding to this matter, thus writes: "Another remnant of the ancient system stood upon a more questionable ground [than that of the wafer bread at the sacrament]. King Edward's first service book gave some authority, tacitly withdrawn

in the second, to prayers for the dead. At Northampton, down to the year 1569, persons were requested, by sound of bell carried before the corpse, to pray for the soul recently departed." A proof of this is furnished by one of the rules, or stipulations, in the agreements by the ministers of Northampton in 1571. The 16th article reads thus: "The carrying of the bell before corpses in the streets, and bidding prayers for the dead [calling on people to pray for the dead], which was there used until within these two years, is restrained." — *Strype's Annals*, vol. II. pt. I. chaps. 10, 31, pp. 136, 472; *Neal*, I. 291.

Archbishop Williams, in his Manual of Prayers, (pages 84–87,) says that the prayers in the old liturgies, said to have been offered for the dead, "were conceived for men dying and passing, not dead already, and so they are still (1672) used in the church of England." But Lathbury, a very thorough churchman, says: "Williams evidently confounds two practices together, namely, praying for the faithful departed, and for those who were in dying circumstances. The latter custom was retained by the Reformers, as is manifest from the rule relative to the passing bell, but the former existed in some early liturgies, notwithstanding the assertion of Williams, and this was rejected by the English church." — *Hist. Book of Common Prayer*, p. 6. From what has been quoted from Edward's liturgy, it is evident that praying for the dead was at first enjoined by the early Reformers, and only tacitly withdrawn by them and by Elizabeth.

END OF VOL. II.



